DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 835	95	CG 008 987

AUTHOR	Peck, Robert F.; And Others
TITLE	Coping Styles and Achievement: A Cross-National Study of School Children. Vol. 4 of Seven Volumes: Family Antecedents of Coping Behavior in Eight Countries. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Texas Univ., Austin. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.; Texas Education Agency, Austin. Dept. of Occupational Education and Technology.
PUB DATE	Apr 74
CONTRACT	OEC-5-85-063
NOTE	188p.; See related document ED 086 812
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$9.00 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Adjustment (to Environment); Comparative Analysis; *Cross Cultural Studies; Interviews; Occupational Information; *Parent Child Relationship; *Personal Adjustment; Social Adjustment; Statistical Studies; *Testing Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Coping

ABSTRACT

This report is the fourth in a series of seven, all of which are concerned with coping styles of school children in the U.S.A., Brazil, Mexico, England, West Germany, Italy, and Yugoslavia. For this study, a lengthy structured interview was held with the mothers of 10 percent of the 6,400 children who had been tested in Stage I of the Cross-National Study of Coping Styles and Achievement, and with the mothers of 80 of the 800 children tested in Germany in Stage III. In half of these families, in all countries except Germany, the father was also interviewed, separately. The interview was designed to elicit the parent's description of the child's coping style and coping effectiveness, in and out of school; the parent's child-rearing practices; the parent's own coping style; and the parent's aspirations and expectations for the child, educationally and vocationally. The interview transcripts were coded, then scaled, yielding highly reliable scores for 58 variables. These parent-derived scores were then correlated with relevant Stage I measures of the children, and the mothers' scores were correlated with the fathers' scores. The dominant finding was the notable lack of validity of the parent reports. The major conclusion was that parents, in all countries, were a very unreliable source of information about the hopes, efforts, coping style, or performance of their children. (Author)

ED 092835

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL REPORT
Project No. HRD-167-65
Contract No. OE-5-85-063
Contract No. 29390

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT: A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

VOLUME IV of VII VOLUMES
FAMILY ANTECEDENTS OF COPING BEHAVIOR IN EIGHT COUNTRIES

Participating Investigators

Arrigo L. Angelini, Brazil
Rogelio Diaz-Guerrero, Mexico
Kenneth M. Miller, England
Walther Jaide, West Germany
Franz Weinert, West Germany
Rolf Piquardt, West Germany

Leon Zorman, Yugoslavia
Ivan Tolicic, Yugoslavia
Marcello Cesa-Bianchi, Italy
Robert J. Havighurst, U.S.A.
Shunichi Kubo, Japan

Robert F. Peck
The University of Texas at Austin
Education Annex Room 3.203
Austin, Texas 78712
U.S.A.

April, 1974

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Texas Education Agency. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education or Texas Education Agency position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Occupational Research and Development,
Department of Occupational and Technical Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 008 987

FOREWORD

The very large, complex testing program required for the study, involving several thousand children in each country, could not have been carried out with the accuracy and completeness which were so vitally necessary, without the extremely hard, thoughtful, dedicated effort of the research staff in each of the participating centers. Thereafter, the development of truly uniform scoring systems for the many instruments and the actual scoring of thousands of protocols were also the product of these researchers, led by the principal investigators. It scarcely does justice to their conscientious, deeply insightful work merely to list their names. But that, at least, must be done, as a very small token of the gratitude each one of them so richly deserves. Station by station, here are the people who carried out the work of the study.

Sao Paulo, Brazil

Dr. Arrigo L. Angelini, Principal Investigator
Dr. Hebe R. C. Angelini, Research Associate
Dr. Romeu M. Almeida, Research Assistant
Dr. Geraldina P. Witter, Research Assistant
Dr. Jose Fernando Bittencourt Lomonaco, Research Assistant
Miss Maria Helena S. Patto, Research Assistant
Mr. Antonio P. Agatti, Research Assistant
Mrs. Carmen S. Andalo, Research Assistant
Miss Quelita R. Correa, Secretary
Miss Rachel Ferraz Oliveira, Secretary
Mr. Luiz T. Aragao, Data Clerk
Mrs. Wilma A. Gebara, Data Clerk

Mexico City, Mexico

Dr. Rogelio Diaz-Guerrero, Principal Investigator
Dr. Luis Lara Tapia, Sub-Director of Research
PSIC. Maria Luisa Morales, Senior Research Assistant and Field Work Supervisor
Dr. Rene Ahumada, Senior Research Assistant
PSIC. Isabel R. De Ahumada, Senior Research Assistant
PSIC. Ma. De La Luz Fernandez, Senior Research Assistant
Miss Alicia Velazquez M., Junior Resarch Assistant
PSIC. Raul Bianchi, Junior Research Assistant
PSIC. Pedro Diaz G., Junior Research Assistant
PSIC. Graciela Diaz G., Junior Research Assistant
Miss Silvia Diaz G., Junior Research Assistant
PSIC. Brenda M. Re Y Regis, Junior Research Assistant
Mr. Raul Tenorio, Junior Research Assistant
Mrs. Consuelo Fernandez De Limon, Secretary

London, England

Dr. Kenneth M. Miller, Principal Investigator
Mrs. Margaret Miller, Senior Investigator
S. Spensley, Research Assistant
Sue Petrie, Research Assistant
John Marshall, Research Assistant
Kim Kirsner, Research Assistant
Margaret Boyd, Research Assistant
Elizabeth Stewartson, Research Assistant
Pamela Williams, Research Assistant
Elizabeth Boyd, Research Assistant
Elizabeth Leffman, Secretary
M. Plenderleith, Data Clerk

West Germany

Dr. Walther Jaide, Principal Investigator, Hannover
Dr. Franz Weinert, Principal Investigator, Heidelberg
Dr. Rolf Piquardt, Principal Investigator, Koblenz
Dr. Barbara Hille, Hannover
Mr. Lothar Quack, Heidelberg

Milano, Italy

Dr. M. Cesa-Bianchi, Principal Investigator
Dr. P. Calegari, Research Assistant
Dr. Laura Scalera, Research Assistant
Dr. G. Brasco, Research Assistant
Dr. D. Gallotti, Research Assistant
Dr. M. Polizzi, Research Assistant
Mr. R. Noe, Part-time Collaborator
Mr. L. Pliteri, Part-time Collaborator
Miss V. Savoia, Part-time Collaborator
Mr. M. Libutti, Part-time Collaborator
Mr. W. Di Chio, Secretary
Mr. L. Penck, Secretary
Mr. M. Zamberletti, Secretary
Mrs. F. Cavalli, Secretary
Mrs. G. Lupatin, Secretary
Mrs. M. Zamberletti, Data Clerk
Miss M. Zamberletti, Data Clerk
Miss L. Schilton, Data Clerk
Mrs. R. Sinisi, Data Clerk
Miss S. Ricci, Data Clerk
Mrs. Pandiani, Data Clerk

Ljubljana, Yugoslavia

Dr. Leon Zorman, Principal Investigator
Dr. Ivan Tolicic, Principal Investigator

Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

Dr. Robert Havighurst, Principal Investigator
Dr. Guy Manaster, Research Associate III
Rena Appel, Secretary
Joyce Bolinger, Research Assistant
Sandra Drake, Research Assistant
Lynda Hoffman, Research Assistant
June Isaacson, Research Assistant
Hellgard Rauh, Research Assistant
Joel Rich, Research Assistant
Beba Varadachar, Research Assistant
Jacqueline Wallen, Research Assistant
Peggy Frazier, Secretary
Edythe Havighurst, Secretary

Austin, Texas, U.S.A.

Dr. Robert F. Peck, Principal Investigator
Dr. Carl Finley Hereford, Associate Director, 1965-1967
Dr. Walter F. Stenning, Research Scientist
Dr. Owen R. Pratz, Social Science Research Associate V
Luis F. Natalicio, Social Science Research Associate IV
Elaine Abbott Michelis, Social Science Research Associate IV
Joel R. Levy, Social Science Research Associate III
Thomas K. Saville, Social Science Research Associate III
Robert L. Shaw, Social Science Research Associate III
Wilford A. Lawrence, Social Science Research Associate II
Liliana Baltra, Social Science Research Associate II
Susan J. Deline, Social Science Research Assistant II
William E. Lakins, Social Science Research Associate II
Lawrence W. Wilkinson, Social Science Research Associate II
Marilyn Doris Strauss, Social Science Research Associate II
Una Jacqueline Winfrey Calkins, Social Science Research Associate II
John Edward Schultz, Social Science Research Assistant II
Ralph W. Nemir, Social Science Research Assistant II
Elds Alicia Alva, Social Science Research Associate I
John Avant, Social Science Research Associate I
Dick Sullivan Calkins, Social Science Research Associate I
Stuart Frager, Social Science Research Associate I
Camille Thom Lynch, Social Science Research Associate I
Eleanor Anne Newton, Social Science Research Associate I
Janis Ann Ratzlow, Social Science Research Associate I
Anne Raynes, Social Science Research Associate I
Clydette D. Sitton, Social Science Research Associate I

Diana Crow Stenning, Social Science Research Associate I
John Sheffield, Social Science Research Associate IV
Jim Sherrill, Computer Programmer I
James Buchanan, Computer Programmer I
Dale Varnum Clark, Computer Programmer I
Margery L. Barton, Keypunch Operator II
Alice Marie Isbell, Keypunch Operator I
Martha J. Knight, Keypunch Operator I
David Shaut, Editor
Natalie Elizabeth Leyendecker, Administrative Secretary
Margaret Valeintine Wheeler, Administrative Secretary
Kay Audrey Lambert Bunce, Senior Secretary
Violeta Juana Chiok, Senior Secretary
Frances Jean Gibson Turner, Senior Secretary
Elma F. Frieling, Administrative Secretary
Martha Ann Caylor, Senior Clerk-Typist
Susan Clements, Senior Clerk-Typist
Joan Foss, Senior Clerk-Typist
Kathryn L. Baker, Senior Clerk-Typist
Martha June Skinner, Senior Clerk-Typist
Marsha Claire Ashely, Clerk-Typist
Joanne F. Howard, Clerk-Typist
Susan Lenz, Clerk-Typist
Sandi Kaye Leyendecker, Clerk-Typist
Cheryl Raindl Maxwell, Clerk-Typist
Linda Sue Yarbrough, Clerk-Typist
Macyl A. Burke, Jr., Statistical Clerk I
Mary Scott Champ, Statistical Clerk I
Eva E. Littrell, Statistical Clerk
Bonnie Huey-Chen Chiang, Clerk
Clara Crow, Clerk
Joyce E. Gander, Clerk
Maria Madalena Monteiro, Clerk
Thomas F. Rider, Clerical Assistant

Tokyo, Japan

Dr. Masunori Hiratsuka, Director, National Institute for Educational Research
Prof. Michio Nishibori, Administrative Director
Prof. Shunichi Kubo, Principal Investigator
Dr. Eiichi Kajita, Principal Investigator
Kanichi Takagi, Prof. of Psychology, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo
Masatoshi Seya, Assistant Prof. of Educational Psychology, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo
Ryoichiro Kosen, Assistant Prof. of Educational Psychology, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo
Masaaki Yoshida, Assistant Prof. of Educational Psychology, Japan Womens University, Tokyo
Yasua Aoyagi, Researcher - Kazuko Kunieda, Secretary
Michiko Kubo, Secretary - Yoshiko Yamazaki, Translator
Junko Honma, Data Clerk - Sachiko Toki, Data Clerk

When all of the data had been collected, scored, and transmitted to the central station in Austin, several years were required to carry out the data processing and the unprecedentedly large-scale statistical analyses. Various vicissitudes, such as periodic, major breakdowns in the computer facilities, and human errors which required redoing of some large analyses, delayed completion beyond the expiration date of the original grant. At this point, Dr. Gary Borich volunteered to see through to completion all of the analyses of Stage I data which were needed for Volumes II, IV, and VI of this series of reports. Thanks to his research acumen, his statistical sophistication and his managerial skills, all of these analyses have finally been completed, fully and correctly. John Sheffield did the computer programming and carried out the final data processing for the regression analyses reported in Volume V.

The basic computer programs for all of these analyses were originally designed by Dr. Donald Veldman of The University of Texas at Austin, who gave invaluable advice at many stages throughout the study. Dr. Veldman also took complete charge of the Analysis of Variance analyses of the Stage III data reported in Volume V.

A large share of gratitude is due to Mrs. Mary Purcell, Mrs. Hazel Witzke, and Miss Linda Flowers, for their expert help in the preparation of the final manuscripts for these reports.

Although they are named in the list of staff members in the Austin station, special recognition must be given to Elaine Michelis and Elma Frieling. Mrs. Michelis worked on the study from its beginning in 1965 until its completion in 1972. She was primarily responsible for developing the objectified scoring systems for both the Sentence Completion and the Story Completion instruments, throughout their intricate evolutions. She also wrote substantial parts of the final manuscripts. Mrs. Frieling has served as executive secretary to the project for its final two years, meticulously organizing the literally thousands of details which had to be brought together and kept together in order to bring the project to a successful completion.

To Dr. Oliver Bown, my partner of many years and co-director with me of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, I owe a great debt of gratitude for the many months, over these seven years, when he has single-handedly managed the R & D Center at those times when I had to be abroad, working with my colleagues in this international study.

All of us feel a deep gratitude to Dr. Alice Scates of the U.S. Office of Education for her original encouragement and the continuing, wise guidance she has given us over the years. Similarly, we are intensely grateful for the unflaggingly patient, understanding help given by Dr. Clay Brittain, Dr. Judith Weinstein, Dr. Susan Klein and Dr. Laurence Goebel, the officers in charge of the project for the U.S. Office of Education. Dr. John R. Guemple and Dr. Oscar Millican of the Texas Education Agency gave indispensable support in the final phase of the project. Without their help, these volumes of reports could not have been produced. The most literal debts of all are owed to the Congress of the United States, to the Research Division of the Vocational Education Branch of the U.S. Office of Education, and to the Texas Education Agency, for providing the financial support without which this study could not have been carried out.

Robert Peck
Austin, Texas
1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME IV of VII VOLUMES

TITLE PAGE

FOREWORD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

SECTION I
OVERVIEW

Introduction . . . . I - 1
The Parent Interview Guide . . . . I - 4
Selection of Sample. I - 15
Training of Interviewers . . . . I - 15
Parent Interview Coding Manual . . . . I - 17
Parent Interview Scaling Manual. . . . . I - 78

SECTION II
PROCEDURE: INTRACOUNTRY REPORTS

BRAZIL . . . . II - 109
MEXICO . . . . II - 114
ENGLAND. . . . . II - 119
GERMANY. . . . . II - 121
ITALY. . . . . II - 124
YUGOSLAVIA . . . . II - 126
CHICAGO. . . . . II - 127
AUSTIN . . . . II - 131
JAPAN. . . . . II - 133

SECTION III
FINDINGS: INTERCOUNTRY ANALYSES

Validity of Mothers' Reports of their Children's Academic Performance . . . . III - 135

Validity of Mothers' Reports of their Children's Specific Coping Skills . . . . III - 136

Validity of Mothers' Reports of Children's Coping Effectiveness. . . . . III - 138

Comparability of Mothers' Report and Child's Report of the Child's Coping Style. . . . . III - 142

Mothers' Reports of Child-Rearing Practices Related to Child Behavior . . . . III - 151

Mothers' Coping Styles in Relationship to Child Coping Behavior. . . . . III - 160

Mothers' Career Aspirations Compared with Their Children's Aspirations and Achievement. . . . . III - 165

Comparison of Father Interview Data with Child Characteristics . . . . III - 168

Comparison of Father and Mother Descriptions of Their Child . . . . III - 173

Comparison of Mother and Father Self-Descriptions . . III - 173

List of Tables

Table 1 - Maternal Reports of Child Coping Correlated with Actual Child Achievement and Coping Scores III - 143

Table 2 - Mothers' Reports of Their Child-Rearing Practices Correlated with Actual Children's Achievement and Coping Scores . . . . III - 153

Table 3 - Mothers' Reports of Their Personal Coping Styles Correlated with Their Children's Achievement and Coping Scores . . . . III - 161

Table 4 - Mother's Career Aspirations for Child Correlated with Child's Aspirations and Achievements . . . III - 167

Table 5 - Paternal Reports of Child Coping Correlated with Actual Child Achievement and Coping Scores. . . III - 169

Table 6 - Correlations of Mother and Father Descriptions of Their Child. . . . . III - 174

Table 7 - Correlations of Mother and Father Self-Descriptions. . . . . III - 177

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT: A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

ABSTRACT

Family Antecedents of Coping Behavior in Eight Countries

A lengthy, structured interview was held with the mothers of ten percnet of the 6,400 children who had been tested in Stage I of the Cross-National Study of Coping Styles and Achievement, and with the mothers of 80 of the 800 children tested in Germany in Stage III. In half of these families, in each country except Germany, the father was also interviewed, separately. The interview was designed to elicit the parent's description of the child's coping style and coping effectiveness, in and out of school; the parent's child-rearing practices; the parent's own coping style; and the parent's aspirations and expectations for the child, educationally and vocationally. The interview transcripts were coded, then scaled, yielding highly reliable scores on some 58 variables.

These parent-derived scores were then correlated with relevant Stage I measures of the children (Stage III, in Germany), and the mothers' scores were correlated with the fathers' scores.

The dominant finding was the notable lack of validity of the parent reports. The mothers knew reasonably well what kind of grades the teachers were giving their children. Beyond that, their reports of their children's behavior bore no more than a chance relationship to the independent measures of behavior, whether from peer ratings or from self-reports. The fathers knew even less about their children. In only three countries, Brazil, Mexico and Yugoslavia, did they come at all near to the actual GPA's of their children, when estimating their school performance. Otherwise, in no country did fathers know much at all that corresponded to the independent data on their children.

In Japan, fathers and mothers agreed considerably more often in describing their child than in the other countries. Also in Japan and in Austin, the mothers and fathers resembled each other in their self-descriptions on a significant number of attributes; whereas there were as many contrasts as similarities in Mexico and Italy.

The major conclusion was that parents, in all countries, were a very unreliable source of information about the hopes, efforts, coping style or performance of their own children. Mothers in almost all countries knew fairly well how teachers evaluated their children; but fathers did not know even this, in most places. As for coping ability in peer relations, authority relations, in dealing with anxiety or aggression, neither parent reported his child accurately in any country, with only a few, widely scattered, small exceptions.

SECTION I

OVERVIEW

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT: A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The University of Texas at Austin

1974

SECTION I

OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

While Stage I of the project had been concerned with testing ten- and fourteen-year-old children, Stage II was concerned with interviewing a selected sample of the parents of the children tested.

The interview was planned with more than one purpose in mind. In the first place, it was hoped that it would provide validating information for some of the Stage I data collected from the children, particularly on the projective instruments -- the Story Completion, the Sentence Completion, and the Social Attitudes Inventory. There were also some questions that related to the information given by the child on the Demographic Questionnaire and the Occupational Interest Inventory. These specific comparisons of Stage I and Stage II data are being dealt with in this volume (Volume IV).

The interview was also designed to serve a broader purpose of collecting information regarding parents' own attitudes and values and parent/child interaction as seen from the parents' point of view.

In this way the Stage II results could be related to the Stage I results in an explanatory fashion. These results also could permit a cross-cultural study of parents, alone.

The interview, then, was primarily concerned with coping behavior and the factors that influence it. Thus, most of the questions arose from a conceptual system developed during Stage I of the study. The work of a number of previous investigators was drawn on. The studies of Dave and Wolf on home environment were considered, with particular regard to Academic Task Achievement. The work of Maccoby and Levin and the Berkeley growth studies was also considered. With regard to format and question construction, the source most heavily used for initial ideas was the work of Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook. In addition, earlier studies by Hereford, Havighurst, and Peck were drawn upon.

Specific Questions

Because of their validational nature, a number of questions were phrased in a manner very similar to that used in the children's instruments. To take the projective instruments first, twelve of the Sentence Completion stems were paired with questions in the interview. The relationship with the Story Completion instrument was not so extensive but there were certain questions that could be related to certain stories.

The first fourteen questions in the interview related to demographic information and covered the same areas as the child's demographic questionnaire. The occupational interest questions included not only the parents' reports of the child's aspirations and expectations but also the parents' aspirations and expectations for the child.

These validating questions did not follow each other in strict sequence. Rather the interview was planned so that questions relating to specific areas would be dealt with together, making it easier for both parent and interviewer. Thus, the interview was divided into two main parts. Questions 1 - 88 dealt with information related either to the child or to parent/child interaction; questions 89-110 dealt with parent relevant information.

The child-centered questions were structured in the following way:

Question	Type of Information
1 - 22	Demographic
23 - 38	School oriented questions including Academic Task Achievement as well as Parents' Attitude to School
39 - 44	Child Activities including Parent/ Child Interaction
45 - 55	Nonacademic Task Achievement
56 - 62	Child's reaction to Authority
63 - 68	Nonacademic Task Achievement outside home
69 - 72	Occupational Interests
73 - 76	Interpersonal Relations
77 - 81 and 88	Anxiety
82 - 87	Aggression

In the parent centered section of the interview the questions were arranged as follows:

90 - 94	Further Education
95 - 103	Occupational Information

104 - 107	Reaction to Criticism
108 - 109	Aggression

Apart from validating aspects, it was hoped that three main types of information would be obtained. The first was coping style information, which was covered from several points of view. One was concerned with the child's actual coping style as seen by the parents, in the areas already being investigated, i.e., Task Achievement, Anxiety, Aggression, Authority, and Interpersonal Relations. Information was also obtained from the parents about their own coping styles in a variety of situations under the same area headings.

The second kind was occupational information. This was information relevant not only to occupational interests but also to occupational values. In the latter case the parents were asked to rank the fifteen occupational values to permit a direct statistical comparison with the children's data. In addition, for working parents, information was obtained about their own occupational history, attitudes and values toward their jobs and their coping behavior while working.

Third was achievement information. Questions involving Task Achievement by the child were divided into the two major areas of Academic and Nonacademic Achievement. Nonacademic Achievement related to jobs or chores in the home and for fourteen-year-old children to paid jobs outside the home. Questions concerning Academic Achievement centered primarily around homework, as this was the area of education with which parents were most familiar. Questions in these areas included not only the child's performance in the homework area but the parents' participation and support both for homework and generalized educational endeavors. In addition, the parents were asked for their evaluation of the child's performance in school.

Construction of the Interview

At the London Conference in 1966 the major responsibility for the development of the Parent Interview was assigned to Austin and London and the bulk of the construction and pilot testing took place at these two stations. The initial form of the instrument caused concern in a number of stations because of its length. It was thought that the parents would find it too tedious and that rapport would be lost. Revisions of this form were therefore carried out by both stations and agreement reached on a second version. This version was sent to all stations for translation and pilot testing. On the basis of results from all stations a shortened form of the interview was constructed and once more distributed to all stations for translation and pilot testing. This form went through two additional revisions in Austin and London before the final form was agreed on at a meeting in New York in January, 1967. This final form was sent to all countries for translation and the translated version returned to Austin and London, after back-translation and checking in each country.

The final interview form consisted of one hundred nine questions plus the ranking of the fifteen occupational values. Each value was printed on a separate card and the parents placed these in order of preference.

STAGE II - PARENT INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

My name is ________________________________
I am from The University of Texas.

Last year your child was part of a large group in Austin selected to fill out some questionnaires at school. At the same time, similar groups of children in seven different countries were filling out the same questionnaires. We are interested in finding out how children handle different kinds of situations, what they think about jobs, occupations, and school.

We hope the results of this project will help improve education here and in other countries, too.

This year we are interviewing parents - here in Austin and in the same other countries we used last year. We would like to talk to mothers and fathers, too.

We, here at The University of Texas, are not interested in individuals as such, but Americans in general. Your replies will be coded and are strictly confidential. The interview takes about an hour. Would you co-operate with us and answer a few questions?

Answers to frequently asked questions:

Are you selling anything? ...... No.

Does this have anything to do with my child's grades?....... No.

Who is paying for this? ...... The University of Texas through a grant from the U.S. Office of Education.

Have the Austin Schools approved of this? .... Yes.

Why was I selected? .... Because your child was one of the ones who filled out our questionnaires at school last year.

What use will be made of this material? ...... It will be used for scientific and research purposes only to help improve education.

INFORMATION SHEET

1. Interviewer________________________________Father-Mother

2. ID Number____________ Child's First Name__________Age Group______

3. Ages of X's Brothers and Sisters (M,F)__________________________

____

4. What adults live in your home?
Mother Others (who else?)
Father
Grandmother
Grandfather

____

5. Who takes care of X? (Main responsibility for X)
Mother Other
Father

6. Who else takes care of X? (Takes some responsibility for or spends time with X)

____

7. Birth Place (Mother)______________________________________

8. Birth Place (Father)______________________________________

9. Mother's Year of Birth________________(Age:_______________)
25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64

10. Father's Year of Birth________________(Age:_______________)
25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64

11. Mother's Occupation______________________________________

12. Father's Occupation______________________________________

13. Mother's Education______________________________________

14. Father's Education______________________________________

____

15. Time in Present House: less than 1 1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 11-12
13-14 15+

16. Where else have you lived since X was born?

17. Have there been any occasions when X has been away from home for 6 months or more?
Yes (if yes) Why?
No

18. (If yes) How old was X then?____________

19. Has X ever been in the hospital?
Yes (If yes) Why?
No

20. (If yes) For how long? ______________

21. (If yes) How old was X then?________________

22. Have there been any occasions when either parent has been living away from home regularly or for 6 months or more?

Mother	Father
Yes (If yes, what circumstances)	Yes (If yes, what circumstances)
No	No

23. Now we would like to get some information regarding X. Please give me some words or phrases which you feel describe X in terms of his schoolwork.

(If not answered fully above, get information on the following questions)

24. How does X feel about school?

25. What makes him feel that way?

26. How do you think he does in school?

27. Do you do anything to encourage X in his schoolwork?
Yes (If yes) what do you do?
NO

28. Have you met X's teacher?
Yes (If yes) How did you meet?
No

29. When X has homework what does he usually do?

(If not answered fully above, get information on the following questions)

30. How does he go about it?

31. What do you do to see that X gets his homework done?

32. How often does he put off his homework to do other things?
Always
Frequently
Sometimes
Seldom
Never

33. What would he do if he were nearly finished with his homework and he found that he had been doing it the wrong way?

34. What do you feel the school's job or responsibility is?

35. How important do you think school is?
Most important
Very important
Important
Unimportant
Worthless

(If not answered fully above)

36. Why?

37. How far would you like your child to go in school?

38. How far do you think he really will go in school?

We are also interested in what children do outside of school; how they spend their time, their activities, how much time they spend around adults, how much with the family, etc.

39. When he is not in school, what kinds of things does X do?

(If not answered fully above, ask:)

40. What kinds of things does he do with you?

41. What kinds of things does he do with his mother?
father?

42. What kinds of things does he do with the family?

43. Does he belong to any clubs, organizations, or groups?
Yes (If yes, list)
No

44. Does he have any hobbies, lessons, or classes?
Yes (If yes, list)
No

---

45. When you want X to do something, how do you go about getting him to do it?

46. How does he respond to this?

47. What follow up is needed to see that he does it?

48. If you see that he is not doing a job the right way, what do you do?

49. How does he react to this?

---

50. What jobs or chores does he have around the house?

(If any chores are mentioned, get information on the following questions)

51. What are the reasons for his having them?

52. How often do you have to see that he does them?
Always
Frequently
Sometimes
Seldom
Never

53. Does he try to get others to do them for him?
Yes (If yes) Who?
No

54. How well does he do them?
Excellent
Good
Satisfactory
Poor
Very Poor

55. How often does X help around the house without being asked?
Always
Frequently
Sometimes
Seldom
Never

56. How do you usually discipline or punish X?

57. What does he do? (In response to punishment mentioned in 56)

58. How does his father usually discipline or punish X?
mother

59. What does X do? (In response to punishment mentioned in 58)

60. How does he react when you criticize him?

61. How does he react when his father criticizes him?
mother

62. How does he react when his brothers and sisters or other children criticize him?

(Do not ask parents of 10 year olds 63 through 68)

63. Does X have a regular job or work outside the home? (Record whether after school or during vacation)
Yes (If yes) What does he do?
No

(If not answered fully above, get information on the following questions)

64. How does he feel about his job?

65. Why does he work?

66. How did he get his job?

67. How hard does he work at his job?

68. Does he ask for help when he runs into problems or difficulties on the job?
Yes
No

---

69. What particular type of job or occupation would you like to see X take up when he is grown?

70. What type of job or occupation would you not like to see X take up when he is grown up?

71. What type of work do you feel X would like to do when he grows up?

72. What type of work do you feel X probably will do when he grows up?

73. Children are different in how they get along with other children. How does X get along with other children?

74. What do you do to help X get along with other children?

75. In what ways do X's friends influence his behavior?

76. What do you think about this? (Friend's influences described in 75)

---

77. When X gets worried what does he do about it?

(If not answered fully above, get information on the following questions)

78. What kinds of things does he worry about?

79. How do you tell when X is worried?

80. When he has worries does he turn to others for help?
Yes (If yes) Who?
No

81. What do you usually advise X to do when he is worried?

82. What kinds of things make X angry?

(If not answered fully above)

83. What else besides his brother and sisters make him angry?

84. What does X usually do when he gets angry?

85. What does X usually do when he gets angry at you?

86. What does X usually do when he gets angry at his father?

87. What does X usually do when a friend is angry at him?

---

88. What does X usually do when someone hurts his feelings?

In addition to the information you've given us about X at home and school, we're also interested in your ideas and activities as a parent.

89. Different people feel different things are important. What do you feel are the important things a child should learn as a person, as he is growing up?

90. Have you taken any courses or training since you left school?
Yes (If yes) What kind?
No

(If yes, get information on the following questions)

91. Why did you take it (them)?

92. When did you take it (Them)?

93. Did you complete it (them)?
Yes
No (If no) What happened?

94. Do you feel you gained from it?
Yes (If yes) How?
No

(Do not ask 95 through 103 of housewives)

95. You said you were a ________________________, could you tell me how you came to be in this kind of work?

96. What is your job like?

(If not answered fully above, get information on the following questions)

97. How do you feel about it?

98. What do you like about it?

99. What do you dislike about it?

100. Would you choose the same kind of work if you had it to do over again?
Yes
No

101. When you are on the job and problems come up about the work, what do you do?

102. What is the best way to get along with your fellow workers (colleagues)?

103. What is the best way to get along with your boss or supervisor? (do not ask of professionals who have no supervisor)

---

104. What do you think or do when criticized?

(If not answered fully above, get information on the following questions)

105. By husband?
wife?

106. By friends?

107. By your own children?

108. What kinds of things make you angry?

109. What do you usually do when you are angry?

---

110. ______ do interesting things
______ do different things
______ nice place to work
______ invent new things
______ what father does
______ always having a job
______ help other people
______ lead other people

______ artist
______ money
______ get ahead
______ own way
______ be famous
______ people you like
______ doing job well

Now there is another thing I would like you to do for me. Here are some cards on which are printed some statements about work. Would you please read each one and then sort the cards into two piles. In the left hand pile put those which you would consider least important in choosing a job.

When this has been done say "Now I would like you to take each pile and place them in order from most to least, so on top of the left hand pile is the card with the statement that would be the most likely to influence you in choosing a job while at the bottom of the right hand pile is the card with the statement that would be the least important to you."

111. Is there anything else about X that you would like to tell me?

For the most part, the parents' responses to the questions were recorded verbatim by the interviewer. A few of the questions, such as age, for example, were pre-coded and a few of the responses were recorded along a dimension such as degree of satisfaction or importance. For example, responses to the question "How important do you think school is?" were coded as -- Most Important

Very Important
Important
Unimportant
Worthless

In these instances of coded questions, however, there was almost always a following probe so that a verbal response from the parents was also available. In the case of the example above, the probe was "Why?"

In addition to the actual questions there was a section that dealt with what were termed post-interview ratings. These dealt with dimensions of behavior that it was thought were embodied in coping style. As these dimensions were not finalized until after the interview questions were constructed there was some doubt as to whether sufficient information on the dimensions would be obtained from the actual questions. The interviewers were, therefore, asked to complete a five-point rating form for each of the dimensions in the behavior areas of Task Achievement (Academic and Nonacademic), Anxiety, and Parent/Child Interaction.

The purpose of these ratings was primarily to encourage the interviewer to get as much information as possible. If the interviewer knew that he had to make these ratings it was thought that he would be more thorough in collecting the information during the interview.

In addition to the interview form itself, a lengthy manual of instructions to interviewers was constructed. In addition to general instructions this document contained a question-by-question explanation of the purpose and intent of each question and its relationship to the coping dimensions. A copy of this manual was given to every interviewer.

When the original interview form came to be translated it was agreed that the layout could be changed to suit the needs of individual stations, though sufficient space for full recording had to be maintained. However the numbering and sequence of sections remained unchanged.

Selection of Parents

It was agreed at the 1966 London Conference to interview eighty mothers (ten per cell) and at least forty fathers (five per cell). In terms of priority, the mothers came first. To select the sample, the subjects in each cell were divided at the median of the achievement scores. The sample was then randomly selected, half from either side of the median. Any refusals necessitated random replacement from the appropriate half cell. In actual fact, the number of refusals varied across stations. In London, for example, only two mothers had to be replaced, while Mexico City had 11.25% refusals and the percentage in Chicago was even higher.

Training of Interviewers

This varied from country to country, but as much time as possible was devoted to this procedure. Wherever possible, observations of practice interviews by the entire interviewing team in one-way observation rooms was carried out. Group review of practice interviews was another method used. Every interviewer carried out at least two practice interviews that were gone over with him in detail, before actual interviewing of the sample commenced.

The interviewers were either project staff members or interviewers hired specifically for this purpose and given a period of training and practice with this particular interview.

The interview usually lasted from one to two hours and usually took place in the parents' home. However in some stations, Milan for example, the interview took place in the University Department. Mothers and fathers were interviewed separately.

Method of Coding

The verbatim responses to the questions were coded using a system of content categories. These coding categories were developed from a sample of at least twenty-four interviews from each station. The translated responses from each station for each question were typed on small cards that were placed in empirical content categories by independent judges. The consensus of these judgments formed the content coding categories for each question. At this point a deliberate attempt was made to use as many and as fine categories as possible in order to preserve the richness of verbal response. It was felt that categories could be eliminated or collapsed later whereas it would be impossible to discriminate new categories at a later date.

Not all the coding categories were, however, empirically derived at this stage. Some of the categories from the Demographic Questionnaire were used intact and some modifications of the Sentence Completion coding categories were used to give direct comparability with the children's data.

A preliminary coding manual was developed by the Austin and London stations and sent to all stations, who then sent back their suggestions and modifications. The initial manual was revised in the light of these criticisms and the final manual was then translated by each station.

A complex system of coder training and calibration was devised to ensure comparable coding across all stations. The first step was to achieve comparability between Austin and London on a group of twelve interviews from each station. These twenty-four interviews were coded independently by at least two coders in each station, who then reached agreement within stations. The consensus results were then compared and differences discussed by letter and by telephone. When Austin and London were calibrated, i.e., interpreting the manual in exactly the same way, each of the other stations was asked to code twelve of their own interviews, using two or more coders, who then reached consensus and sent the results to Austin and London. These interviews were independently coded in both Austin and London and the results compared with the original station's coding. Differences were discussed and agreement reached. In addition there were some face-to-face meetings among subgroups of stations to discuss and improve coder reliability.

When the period of calibration was finished, the production coding of the entire sample of interviews was undertaken in each station. In the production coding, each interview in each station was coded by at least two independent coders and the final code given was the consensus of these two individuals. The coders in each station were the same individuals who had gone through the calibration process with the Austin and London stations.

This elaborate and time-consuming process was designed to provide the maximum comparability and reliability of interview data from all stations. Although laborious, the use of independent coders and the calibration of these coders across stations proved successful. This method had the additional advantage of greatly reducing the possibility of clerical errors.

PARENT INTERVIEW CODING MANUAL

General Directions

Experience with the first twelve interviews has shown that all interviews must be coded by two coders. The single consensus code numbers of these two scorers are to be sent to Austin on the standard coding sheet. It is essential that the two people doing the coding both be fully familiar with the Interview Coding Manual and be calibrated on the standardization interviews. Only coders so calibrated can be used on production coding. This calibration includes checking the corrected coding and comments on the second twelve interviews when they have been returned from the Central Office.

Each interview is to be completely coded before proceeding to another one, i.e., do not code across questions or sections of several interviews simultaneously. Ordinarily, a given section will be the coding unit, however, supplemental factual information may occur at other places in the interview. No coding should be marked or indicated on the interview protocol itself.

Side comments made by the interviewer may be used by the coder only if they clarify an otherwise ambiguous response. However, it is the parent's response that is coded even though the interviewer may have indicated the parent's response appears not to be accurate. The coder's responsibility is to code what is recorded and to avoid inferences or interpretations. Do not hesitate to use no information categories. These categories may result in missing data but they do not result in incorrect or erroneous data.

Unless multiple coding is specifically called for in the manual only the first response of a multiple or compound response is to be coded. An exception is where there is clear evidence in the parent's statement which indicates that some later part of the response is clearly the dominant or key part, in which case the dominant or key response should be scored; e.g., "sometimes I spank him but usually I send him to his room without his supper." In this case the second part has been clearly indicated by the parent to be the dominant or key element of the response.

Although the I.D. Number is numbered 2 in the interview itself, it should be entered on the first nine columns of the code sheet. The next column indicates whether the interviewee is a mother or a father. Country-specific numbers assigned to interviewers should follow the I.D. number in the next two columns.

The committee realizes that certain stations have found interesting materials in their own interviews other than that which is coded.

This information has not occurred in sufficient frequency to warrant additional or extended codes. Space has been reserved at the end of the code sheet which will allow individual stations to code certain country-specific information. Any country which included additional questions should find space available for coding them here, also.

All responses which are coded "91" should be sent both in English and in the original language to Austin. The 24 interviews coded in the process of preparing the manual and calibrating the scorers will be recoded and will be the last 24 interviews to be coded in production scoring.

Each country should substitute the appropriate insertion for "country-specific" codes taken from the Demographic coding manual or the Occupational Values coding manual where called for. Only the Austin code appears in the present manual.

Sentence Completion codes have been edited for use in this manual. If necessary, please refer to the Sentence Completion manual for the original code.

Codes 91, 93, 95, 97, and 99 will be used for almost all questions and their use and meaning will be invariant.

Code 91 - This is used for relevant responses which are not covered by the existing categories. All responses coded in this category should be listed by I.D. number and question number and forwarded to the Central Office.

Code 93 - Don't know: Where parent has indicated lack of knowledge or said "don't know."

Code 95 - Irrelevant or autistic responses: Any response which does not answer the question, where parent responded verbally but either misunderstood the question or gave an uninterpretable response, e.g., "What is the school job or responsibility?" "I think he should go to work and earn a living instead."

Code 97 - Question not appropriate: This code is used for follow-up questions when the response to the initial question in a section is negative, making the following questions inappropriate. This code is not used in the initial question, as negative responses here are accounted for with a code number other than 97. Note that occasionally follow-up questions in a given section are asked and responses given even though the initial question had a negative response. In this case, change the scoring for the initial question to conform appropriately.

Code 99 - No information: This applies where the parent did not answer or the question was not asked when it appropriately should have been asked. Before using this code, check to be sure the question was not answered elsewhere in the interview, perhaps in a general or opening question to the section. This category means there is a blank, no response of any kind either relevant or irrelevant.

Where information is asked for each parent in relation to the child, the first of the pair of questions will always refer to the mother and the second will always refer to the father, i.e., in 40 and 41, 56-57 and 58-59, 60 and 61, and 85 and 86; 40, 56-57, 60 and 85 are always coded for mother and 41, 58-59, 61 and 86 for the father. Therefore, code mothers' interviews as they occur, in father interviews code question 40 into code column 41, interchange 41 into 40, etc.

	CARD 1 COL.
2. ID NUMBER	1-9
Father-Mother	10

1 Mother
2 Father

1. Interviewer Number	11-12

To be assigned by each country to individual interviewers

3. AGES OF X'S BROTHERS AND SISTERS (M,F)

Code actual number in 3A-S, e.g., 0 = none, 1 = one, etc. 9 = nine or more. If twins, record in order of birth. If order of birth is unknown, code other twin as older.	8=8 or more 9=no information
3A. Number of older brothers	13
3B. Number of younger brothers	14
3C. Number of older sisters	15
3D. Number of younger sisters	16
4. WHAT ADULTS LIVE IN YOUR HOME?	17-18

01 Both parents
02 Mother only
03 Father only
04 One parent and one stepparent
05 Both parents (or stepparent) and other relatives

06 One parent and other relatives
07 One or two parents and non-relatives (include roomers, servants, maids)
08 Other

99 No information

---

5. WHO TAKES CARE OF X? (Main responsibility for X) 19-20

01 Both parents
02 Mother only
03 Father only
04 Other relatives, e.g., grandparent, aunt, sister, etc.
05 Non-relative, e.g., maid
06 Parent and relative
07 Parent and non-relative

99 No information

---

6. WHO ELSE TAKES CARE OF X? 21-22

01 Both parents
02 Mother
03 Father
04 Other relative, e.g., grandparent, aunt, sister
05 Non-relative, e.g., maid
06 Parent and relative
07 Parent and non-relative
08 No one else

99 No information

---

7. BIRTH PLACE (Mother) 23-24

Same as Demographic code (country-specific)

01 Same town
02 Different town, same state (or comparable geographic unit)
03 Rural area (or much smaller town) in same state (or comparable geographic unit)
04 Adjacent state (or comparable geographic unit)
05 Same country but distant state
06 Different country - close cultural similarity
07 Different country - different cultural characteristics

93 Don't know
99 No information

---

8. BIRTH PLACE (Father) 25-26

Same as Demographic code (country-specific)

01 Same town
02 Different town, same state (or comparable geographic unit)
03 Rural area (or much smaller town) in same state (or comparable geographic unit)
04 Adjacent state (or comparable geographic unit)
05 Same country but distant state
06 Different country - close cultural similarity
07 Different country - different cultural characteristics

93 Don't know
99 No information

---

9. MOTHER'S YEAR OF BIRTH 27-28

01 25-29
02 30-34
03 35-39
04 40-44
05 45-49
06 50-54
07 55-59
08 60-64
09 65 or over

99 No information

---

10. FATHER'S YEAR OF BIRTH 29-30

01 25-29
02 30-34
03 35-39
04 40-44
05 45-49
06 50-54
07 55-59
08 60-64
09 65 or over

99 No information

---

11. MOTHER'S OCCUPATION 31-32

Same as "Occupations at the six status levels" plus supplements (country-specific).

01 Medical Doctor, Lawyer, University Professor, Big Business Manager, Government Department Head
02 Accountant, High School Teacher, Social Worker, Dress Designer, Insurance Saleswoman
03 Trained Nurse, Bank Clerk, Primary School Teacher, Laboratory Technician, Secretary
04 Typist, Dress Maker, Restaurant Cook, Telephone Operator, Shop Clerk
05 Factory Worker, Usher in Theatre, Hospital Attendant, Waitress, Beauty Operator
06 Domestic Servant, Baby Sitter, Laundry Worker, Dishwasher, Washroom Attendant
08 Housewife

99 No information

---

12. FATHER'S OCCUPATION 33-34

Same as "Occupations at the six status levels" plus supplements (country-specific).

01 Medical Doctor, Lawyer, University Professor, Big Business Manager, Government Department Head
02 Accountant, High School Teacher, Army Captain, Office Manager, Insurance Agent
03 Traveling Salesman, Bank Clerk, Army Sergeant, Owner of Grocery Store, Bookkeeper
04 Carpenter, Mechanic, Restaurant Cook, Electrician, Shop Clerk
05 Factory Worker, Truck Driver, Waiter, Barber, Soldier
06 Janitor, Street Sweeper, Dock Worker, Day Laborer, Night Watchman

99 No information

---

13. MOTHER'S EDUCATION 35-36

Same as Demographic code (country-specific)

01 University graduate
02 Some college
03 High school graduate
04 Some high school
05 Eighth grade
06 Less than eighth grade

99 No information

---

14. FATHER'S EDUCATION 37-38

Same as Demographic code (country-specific)

01 University graduate
02 Some college
03 High school graduate
04 Some high school
05 Eighth grade
06 Less than eighth grade

99 No information

---

15. TIME IN PRESENT HOUSE 39-40

01 Less than 1 year
02 1-2 years
03 3-4 years
04 5-6 years
05 7-8 years
06 9-10 years
07 11-14 years
08 over 15 years

99 No information

---

16. WHERE ELSE HAVE YOU LIVED SINCE X WAS BORN? 41-42

Enter number of moves. 00 = none, 01 = one move, 02 = two moves, etc.

99 No information

---

17. HAVE THERE BEEN ANY OCCASIONS WHEN X HAS BEEN AWAY FROM HOME FOR 6 MONTHS OR MORE? 43-44

01 No
02 Yes - school
03 Yes - in care, e.g., hospital, correctional institution, foster home

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

18. (IF YES) HOW OLD WAS X THEN? 45-46

Enter age of X at time of separation. 00 = less than one year, 01 = one year, 02 = two years, etc.

97 Not appropriate, never away from home
99 No information

---

19. HAS X EVER BEEN IN THE HOSPITAL? 47-48

Enter the number of admissions to hospital. 00 = none, 01 = one admission, 02 = two admissions, etc.

99 No information

---

20. FOR HOW LONG?

20A. Total time for all admissions 49-50

01 Less than one day, for observation or outpatient
02 1-3 days
03 4-7 days
04 8-15 days
05 16-30 days
06 One month - Six months
07 More than six months

93 Don't know
97 Not appropriate, never admitted to the hospital
99 No information

20B. Length of confinement for longest admission (use same code as 20A if only one admission) 51-52

01 Less than one day, for observation or outpatient treatment
02 1-3 days
03 4-7 days
04 8-15 days
05 16-30 days
06 One month - six months
07 More than six months

93 Don't know
97 Not appropriate, never admitted to the hospital
99 No information

21. HOW OLD WAS X THEN?

21A. Enter age of X at the time of first confinement. 00 = less than one year, 01 = one year, 02 = two years, etc. 53-54

93 Don't know
97 Not appropriate, never admitted to the hospital
99 No information

21B. Enter age of X at the time of longest confinement. 00 = less than one year, 01 = one year, 02 = two years, etc. 55-56

93 Don't know
97 Not appropriate, never admitted to the hospital
99 No information

---

22. HAVE THERE BEEN ANY OCCASIONS WHEN EITHER PARENT HAS BEEN LIVING AWAY FROM HOME REGULARLY FOR SIX MONTHS OR MORE?

22A. Both parents 57

01 No for both
02 Yes, mother
03 Yes, father
04 Yes, both (Also yes if parent is away regularly and home only on weekends)

22B. Mother only 58-59

01 Marital separation or divorce
02 Travel in work (other than military)
03 Military service
04 Health, e.g., hospital (mental or physical)
05 Institutions, e.g., prison (other than hospitals)

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
97 Not appropriate, no separations
99 No information

22C. Father only 60-61

01 Marital separation or divorce
02 Travel in work (other than military)
03 Military service
04 Health, e.g., hospital (mental or physical)
05 Institutions, e.g., prison (others than hospitals)

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
97 Not appropriate, no separations
99 No information

QUESTIONS 23-28 (READ ENTIRE SECTION BEFORE SCORING QUESTIONS)

The information given in 23 may relate to later questions in this section, but will also be coded itself for the types of activity spontaneously mentioned.

23. NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO GET SOME INFORMATION REGARDING X. PLEASE GIVE ME SOME WORDS OR PHRASES WHICH YOU FEEL DESCRIBE X IN TERMS OF HIS SCHOOLWORK. 62-63

01 Achievement - Positive: A statement of positive academic competency. "The best in everything," "He is doing real good," "He is studious."
02 Achievement - Ambivalent: A statement of both positive and negative academic competency. "He is doing all right, had some trouble learning to read," "She is fairly good in the main subjects... sometimes records go down unexpectedly."
03 Achievement - Neutral or average: "Not so much distinguished," "O.K.," "All right."
04 Achievement- Negative: A statement of incompetency. "She does not study much," "Absolutely poor -- much too absorbed in sports."
05 Attitudinal - Affect Positive: A statement of positive attitudes and/or feelings about school work. "She likes school," "...... is very happy in school," "Takes pride in it."
06 Attitudinal - Affect Neutral: "It's inevitable," "Goes because he has to."
07 Attitudinal - Affect Negative: A statement of negative attitudes and/or feelings about school work. " ..... thinks school is a waste of time."
08 Social - Interpersonal - Positive: A statement of liking and/or being with friends and/or teachers. " .... likes all her friends at school, does homework with them," "likes her teachers."
09 Social - Interpersonal - Negative: A statement of not liking and/or being with teachers and/or other children. "... can't get along with teachers this year."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

24. HOW DOES X FEEL ABOUT SCHOOL? 64-65

If information is not here, check #23.

01 Strong positive feelings. "likes it very much," "Loves it."
02 Positive feelings. "Likes it," "Keen on it."
03 Ambivalent feelings. "Likes some subjects, doesn't like others," "Likes sports, doesn't like lessons."
04 Neutral feelings. "He goes," "Doesn't complain."
05 Negative feelings. "Doesn't like it."
06 Strong negative feelings. "Hates it."
07 Descriptive statement of the student's opinion. "Takes it seriously," "Thoughtfully," "A game."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

25. WHAT MAKES HIM FEEL THAT WAY? 66-67

In coding this response, it is immaterial whether the affect itself is positive, neutral or ambivalent, or negative.

01 Intrinsic values, education, learning. "He likes to learn," "He likes it," "He feels it is his duty to go to school."
02 Specific academic subject or subjects. "Mathematics," "Science courses," "Dislikes language."
03 Extracurricular activities at school. "Sports," "Choir," "Chess Club," "On account of football."
04 Social aspects focused on friends and peers. "Friends," "Likes being with other children."
05 Social aspects focused on teacher interaction. "Doesn't like teacher," "Has a good teacher this year."
06 General school environment, the setting, kinds of activities. "Admires the school," "Thinks the school environment is very good (bad)," "Likes (Doesn't like) the discipline."
07 Personal characteristics. "Keen to do well," "Has pride," "Is lazy."
08 Self improvement, includes careers, goals and improving familiar situation. "Sees parents situation," "To get an independent position."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

26. HOW DO YOU THINK HE DOES IN SCHOOL?

This question has a double code. The first (A) is an evaluation of the child's academic performance, the second (B) concerns the parent's satisfaction.

26A. 01 Excellent, very good. All indications of superior achievement 68-69

02 All responses indicating achievement which is definitely above average. "Very well," "Good."

03 All responses indicating achievement which is barely above average or is basically a strong average. "His reports are average but improving," "About average - the last two reports were very good."

04 All responses indicating average achievement. "Average," "She is doing all right, more or less, not above and not below average."

05 All responses indicating below average performance. "Not very well, he is average at most things, but below average in a few things."

06 All responses indicating poor or unsatisfactory work. "Isn't doing well because he doesn't study, is intelligent but doesn't work hard."

07 All responses relating to behavior rather than performance. "Cooperates with others positively."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

26B. 01 No direct indication of either satisfaction or lack of satisfaction 70

02 Parent indicates satisfaction with school achievement, positive affect

03 Parent indicates dissatisfaction with school achievement, negative affect

---

27. DO YOU DO ANYTHING TO ENCOURAGE X IN HIS SCHOOLWORK? 71-72

These codes provide for the identification of the Yes-qualified responses as direct actions, indirect actions, or attitudinal influences.

01 No (any qualification which is scoreable below should be scored as Yes)

02 Yes - unspecified

03 Yes - homework only (includes assistance or seeing that it is done)

04 Yes - academically supportive actions, engage tutors, special classes, coaching

05 Yes - academically enriching actions, including books and opportunities, e.g., encyclopedia, library, museum visits.
06 Yes - attitudinal -- encouragement, interest. "Yes, I try to encourage her to discuss her practice book, etc. with me."
07 Yes - attitudinal--emphasis on future orientation. "Yes, I tell him they need school to get a good job," "Yes, I tell her to study and learn so she can have a better life."
08 Yes - direct action, rewards and punishments. "No T.V. till she gets her grades up."
09 Material support, paper, pencils, quiet room (but not including books as scored in 05)

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

28. HAVE YOU MET X'S TEACHER? YES, NO, HOW DID YOU MEET? 73

01 No
02 Yes - unspecified
03 Yes - school initiated--parent was requested to come to school to talk about child concerning problem, discipline, lack of progress, etc. "Yes, his form mistress came to see us about him, and have met Dr. Roberts (Head) in connection with him."
04 Yes - school initiated--opportunity or invitation to all parents to meet and discuss. "Seldom, once he was administered a test for Vocational Counseling purposes."
05 Yes - formal routine occasions, more observer than participant--PTA, Open House, Programs, etc. "Attend PTA meetings. Never went to school to ask a better grade or to complain."
06 Yes - parent initiated, more participant than observer--takes more than general interest, e.g., PTE office holder, room mother, etc.
07 Yes - parent initiated--non-formal. "I go each occasion to talk to them without being asked to do." "... to see how X is getting along," "Yes, frequently. Spontaneously."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

QUESTIONS 29-33 (READ ENTIRE SECTION BEFORE SCORING QUESTIONS) CARD 2 COL 11-12

29. WHEN X HAS HOMEWORK WHAT DOES HE USUALLY DO?

A study of the responses indicated that from 29 and 30 together it was usually possible to obtain information on two variables. In many cases the first dimension, time or occasion of doing homework, came out in 29 while the second dimension, conditions or methods or homework came out in 30. In some protocols, however, they came in reverse order. Therefore, in order to carry out the two codings, both 29 and 30 must be considered.

01 Does not have any or seldom has any
02 No reference to when homework done. "He does it," "Gets it done."
03 High priority - immediately on coming home or after a brief routine interruption such as a snack or feeding pets
04 At a regular time - after dinner, after TV program, does it at school
05 Usually does it, irregular or no set time
06 Avoids as long as possible, procrastinates, puts off to last possible moment
07 May not do it or does not do it

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

CARD 2 COL 13-14

30. HOW DOES HE GO ABOUT IT?

This information may appear in either 29 or 30. It deals with implementation-initiation, how started rather than follow-up (which applies to 31-32). Note: Score on first 5 dimensions if possible. If not, use 06, 07 or 08. If none of first eight codes can be used, use 09, or 91-99.

01 Self initiation-totally. "He never neglects it," "His own initiative." This code should be used only when parent specifically mentions self-initiation.
02 Self initiation-basically or mainly. "We don't push generally, sometimes he needs reminding."

03 Self-other initiation. "Occasionally he needs a push," "Sometimes he asks for help."
04 Other initiation-but once started he persists. "O.K., once you get him started," "Waits until we remind him, then he stays with it."
05 Other initiation-and must keep after him. "I have to push him to study," "She does them when compelled to."
06 Affect positive, "Eager to do it," "He likes it."
07 Affect neutral or ambivalent
08 Affect negative
09 Conditions (in absence of any of the above) e.g., own room, by T.V., with radio on

91 Other relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, doesn't have or seldom has homework
99 No information

---

31. WHAT DO YOU DO TO SEE THAT X GETS HIS HOMEWORK DONE? 15-16

This is a two column code designed to provide information for comparison with the dimensions based on the children's data, dimensions of self initiation-other initiation, stance or confrontation-avoidance, implementation or direct-indirect. This is generally considered as implementing behavior, after the initiation, e.g., see that it is done rather than getting him started.
Note: As in certain other codes two columns are used. A first or main analysis may be done using the first column only, e.g., a 1 in column one indicates the parent does nothing. The second column permits the breaking out of more detailed information.

11 Nothing--unqualified
12 Nothing--not necessary, indicating the child does it on his own
13 Nothing--responsibility to do it or not do it is left up to the child, parent doesn't bother- "It's left up to him; I trust my children."
14 Nothing--external pressures. "Detention in school if he doesn't."
15 Nothing--other parent's responsibility. "It's up to my wife."
16 Nothing--responsibility of person other than spouse. "Entrust to tutor." "His older brother sees that he does it."
21 Seldom or occasional reminder. "Sometimes ask if he has it."
22 Verbal reminder or question. "Just ask him." "Check up."

23 Nag, frequent or continuous verbal reminder CARD 2
31 Check work occasionally COL
32 Check work--usually or regularly 15-16
33 Observing, watching
41 Deprivation, punishment or rewards
51 Active help or assistance
91 Other, relevant not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, doesn't have homework
99 No information

---

32. HOW OFTEN DOES HE PUT OFF HIS HOMEWORK TO DO OTHER THINGS? 17-18

This is a two column code. The first column represents the main categories taken from the precode. The second column permits a breakdown of the intermediate frequencies for a detailed analysis.

11 Always
21 Frequently, no comments
22 Frequently, indications that the child procrastinates. "Puts it off till the last minute."
23 Frequently, indications that the child is easily distracted
31 Sometimes, no comments
32 Sometimes, on weekends
33 Sometimes, for social reasons. "Plays with friends."
34 Sometimes, for preferred activity done by self, not with others, e.g., T.V., read book, build model airplane
35 Sometimes, situational-procrastinates in one particular subject
36 Sometimes, miscellaneous
41 Seldom, no comments
42 Seldom--procrastinates
43 Seldom--distractions
51 Never
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, doesn't have or seldom has homework
99 No information

---

33. WHAT WOULD HE DO IF HE WERE NEARLY FINISHED WITH HIS HOMEWORK AND HE FOUND THAT HE HAD BEEN DOING IT THE WRONG WAY? CARD 2 COL

This question will provide information on the dimension of confrontation-avoidance and affect. This is a two column code.
Note: Correcting it, doing it again, re-doing, starting over are all to be considered equivalent.

11 Start over
21 Start over, but would be annoyed or unhappy but no mention of expression of feelings. "He would be unhappy but would do it over."
22 Start over, but would express unhappiness or annoyance. "Complain but re-do," "Be unhappy, tear it up and start again."
31 Start over, gets angry but no mention of expression of anger. "He would get mad and do it over."
32 Start over, but expresses anger. "He would say some bad words, maybe stomp about, but would re-do it."
41 Start over, or correct due to pressure, "I make him." "He'd have to."
51 Situational, may depend on teacher or subject
61 Would turn to others for help, advice or receive assistance
71 Would not start over
81 Anxiety, perhaps cry or be upset with no indication of whether or not the work is started over

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, doesn't have or seldom has homework
99 No information

---

34. WHAT DO YOU FEEL THE SCHOOL'S JOB OR RESPONSIBILITY IS? 21-26

For this question, use the codes below to describe the response. Three double columns are used; put the first part of the response in the first double column (unless some other aspect is clearly the dominant or most important aspect of the response). Put the next job or responsibility in the next column, and the third in the third column. "To educate the child, teach them how to get along with others and to respect others, and to prepare him for college" = 02, 08, 10. "To educate them" = 02, 99, 99

CARD 2
COL

01 School subjects. "Specific skills like reading and arithmetic." (This code should only be used where specific subjects skills are mentioned by parent)
02 To educate, to teach generally
03 To promote or teach liberal arts, culture
04 To instil morals, values
05 To maintain or teach discipline. "To keep order."
06 To see that the children do their work. "Make them learn their lessons."
07 To explain, help the child understand the subject or methods.
08 Guidance, individual development, manners. "Get along with others."
09 To build or promote character, personality, personal qualities.
10 Preparation for college or job
11 Preparation for life in general
12 Home contributions or role. "Home should teach discipline, that is not the school's job."
13 Limited. "Not too much homework," "School isn't everything, need time to enjoy things or play."
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

35. HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU THINK SCHOOL IS? 27-28

01 Most important
02 Very important
03 Important
04 Unimportant
05 Worthless

99 No information

---

36. WHY? 29-30

01 Jobs or socio-economic reasons specifically
02 Academic reasons, achievement, prepare for college or further education
03 Personal development. "In their own development and enjoyment of life," "Other-wise children would be illiterate."
04 Social development. "It is important because they have to learn to live and mix with others," "To teach children to live in a community, how they get on at school helps them to learn to give and take."

CARD 2
COL

05 Preparation for life (global). "It is a training ground," "Can't get enough of the answers," "School gives base for life, it's what you learn at school that comes out later."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

37. HOW FAR WOULD YOU LIKE YOUR CHILD TO GO IN SCHOOL? 31-32

This is an aspiration or desire question. Where possible the response should be scored on the standard 6 point scale as established in the Demographic code, the addition of codes 07 and 08 should encompass the rest of the responses.

01 University graduate
02 Some college
03 High school graduate
04 Some high school
05 Eighth grade garduate
06 Less than eighth grade
07 Child's preference. "As far as he wants to."
08 As far as he is able to go. "Can't tell yet, depends on how he develops."
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

38. HOW FAR DO YOU THINK HE REALLY WILL GO IN SCHOOL?

This is for expectation rather than desire.

01 University graduate
02 Some college
03 High school graduate
04 Some high school
05 Eighth grade graduate
06 Less than eighth grade
07 Child's preference. "As far as he wants to."
08 As far as he is able to go. "Can't tell yet, depends on how he develops."
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

QUESTIONS 39-44 (READ ENTIRE SECTION BEFORE SCORING QUESTIONS) CARD 2 COL

WE ARE ALSO INTERESTED IN WHAT CHILDREN DO OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL: HOW THEY SPEND THEIR TIME, THEIR ACTIVITIES, HOW MUCH TIME THEY SPEND AROUND ADULTS, HOW MUCH WITH THE FAMILY, ETC.

39. WHEN HE IS NOT IN SCHOOL, WHAT KINDS OF THINGS DOES X DO? 35-36

Enter the total number of activities spontaneously mentioned by the parent; count only the number of activities mentioned in 39. Although there is interest in some countries in the content of these activities, there is no suggested code other than those covered in 40-44. Any country desiring to do an additional analysis on this or any other item should code the information in the blank columns provided at the end of the coding sheet.

Enter the number of activities mentioned. 00 = none or no activities, 01 = one activity, 02 = two activities, etc.

93 Don't know
99 No information

40. WHAT KINDS OF THINGS DOES HE DO WITH YOU?

Some interviews do not clearly separate the activities participated in with a single parent, a mother or a father, from those done with the whole family. It is essential that this be done. A single response such as "go on picnics" should appear only once if the whole family participates and this should be coded in question 42. If the respondent has definitely stated that sometimes only one parent, e.g., mother, and in other occasions the whole family is involved in the activity, code both for mother in question 40 and for family in question 42.
Note: The first of paired mother and father questions always will be coded for mother; in father interviews the order of 40 and 41 will be reversed. These questions will be analyzed separately in three ways:

A. According to the Sentence Completion code from Stem 2 for mothers and Stem 22 for father. Each is coded twice for both the first and second responses given.
B. Descriptively, items in order mentioned (up to three activities for mother and two for father).
C. For the number of different activities mentioned irrespective of categories in B.

Due to time lapse between testing and interviewing, include any activities of recent past.

CARD 2
COL

40A. Sentence Completion code. Score first two responses. 37-40
Always code response for mother in this question.

01 All responses that consist of talking. The subject matter may be either specified or unspecified. There must be no mention of affect, either positive or negative. "Talk," "Talk about football," "Talk about school."
02 Some specified (non-conversational, non-work) activity. No mention of positive or negative affect. "Go to the show," "Play cards," "Go shopping," "Take walks," "Go to church."
03 Positive affect or enjoyment of the inter-personal relationship even if there is also mention of conversation or activities. All that is necessary for a response to be scored in this category is mention of positive affect, whether in conjunction with activities or mentioned alone. "Have fun," "Enjoy each other," "Have a good time," "Talk and have fun," "Play games and enjoy ourselves."
04 Doing work or some constructive activity together with no affect expressed. "Clean the house," "Wash dishes," "Work."
05 Negative affect or absence of interaction. "Don't like each other," "Fight," "Ignore each other."
06 All neutral descriptive responses. No affect expressed, and there is no mention that they engage in any activity together. "We are very much alike," "See each other."
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

40B. Descriptive. Score first three responses.
Always code response for mother in this question.

01 Household activities including shopping, gardening, etc. "Take kids to school."
02 Conversation
03 Watching T.V., listening to radio or records, nothing in particular, just being around the house
04 Church or other religious activities
05 Activities away from home, outings, sports, picnics
06 Activities at home-indoors or outdoors, making doll clothes, chess, card games, etc.

CARD 2
COL

07 School activities, assistance in homework
08 We do everything together
09 Nothing, very little
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

40C. Always code response for mother in this question. 47-48

Enter total number of mother-child activities (not number of different activities). 00 = none, 01 = one activity, 02 = two activities, etc.

99 No information

41. WHAT KINDS OF THINGS DOES HE DO WITH HIS FATHER/MOTHER?

41A. Sentence Completion Code. Score first two responses. Always code for father in this column. 49-52

01 Some (non-work, non-conversational) activity together with no affect expressed. "Go to the show," "Play ball," "Go for a ride," "Shopping."
02 Talking. The subject matter of the conversation may be either specified or unspecified. No positive or negative affect expressed. "Talk," "Talk about politics," "Talk about many things."
03 Positive affect is either specified or may be inferred from the response. "Have fun," "Enjoy ourselves," "Have a wonderful time."
04 The interaction is of the nature of a constructive or work activity. No positive or negative affect expressed. "Work," "Mow the lawn," "Wash the car," "Build something."
05 All negative interactive and/or emotional responses. "We don't get along," "We hate each other."
06 A lack of interaction but does not express negative affect. "Do nothing," "Are never together."
07 "Neutral" response of a purely descriptive nature. "Think we are alike," "Are together," "Are not apart."
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

41B. Descriptive. Score first two responses. Always code for father in this column. 53-56

01 Household activities including shopping, gardening, etc.
02 Conversation
03 Watching T.V., listening to radio or records, nothing in particular, just being around the house
04 Church or other religious activities
05 Activities away from home, outings, sports, picnics
06 Activities at home either indoor or outdoor, making doll clothes, chess, card games, etc.
07 School activities, assistance in homework
08 We do everything together

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
95 Irrelevant
99 No information
89 Repetition of an earlier response

41C. Always code for father in this column. 57-58

Enter total number of father-child activities. 00 = none, 01 = one activity, 02 = two activities, etc. (not number of different activities)

99 No information

---

42. WHAT KINDS OF THINGS DOES HE DO WITH THE FAMILY? 59-60

Score first one response

01 Household activities
02 Conversation, meals
03 T.V., listening to music, indoor games
04 Church or religious activities. "Visiting graves."
05 Vacations
06 Outings - museums, sporting events, either watching or participating, movies, picnics, eating meals out
07 Visiting relatives
08 "Nothing in particular," "Generally, just together around the house."
09 Absence of interaction, nothing, very little
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

QUESTION 43 and 44

Responses to both questions should be read before coding either. The coding of 43 is to contain only those activities that are carried out within some organized framework; 44 is intended to cover individual activities or lessons.

CARD 2
COL
61-64

43. DOES HE BELONG TO ANY CLUBS, ORGANIZATIONS, OR GROUPS?

Score first two responses.

01 Organized groups, scouts, YMCA or church youth group
02 Sports clubs or groups including country clubs
03 Church groups where activities are primarily religious including serving altar. "church"
04 Music, art, theatre, dance groups or club
05 Intellectual groups, whether school base or not, e.g., Language clubs, science clubs, stamp or collection clubs
06 Service groups, Red Cross, Safety patrol
07 Friendship groups, neighborhood gangs
08 None, no
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

44. DOES HE HAVE ANY HOBBIES, LESSONS, OR CLASSES? 65-68

Score first two responses

01 Cultural, study, music and art
02 Academic, reading, foreign language study
03 Recreational - sport
04 Recreational - intellectual, e.g., collecting models, photography
05 Recreational - domestic or vocational, e.g., cooking or sewing, typing, pets
06 None, no
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

QUESTIONS 45-49 (READ ENTIRE SECTION BEFORE SCORING QUESTIONS)

45. WHEN YOU WANT X TO DO SOMETHING, HOW DO YOU GO ABOUT GETTING HIM TO DO IT? 69-70

Before coding 45 the whole section 45-49 should be read. It may be necessary to transfer information to have it appropriately coded. For example, in some cases the task presentation and child reaction to the presentation were both given in response to question

CARD 2
COL
69-70

45 in which case the child reaction should be dropped to question 46. The information in this section may be considered in relation to the Story Completion and the Sentence Completion (7, 9, 35, 42).

01 The task is presented, no direct reference or suggestion that the child should carry out other by implication. "Poor old Mum needs a cup of tea."
02 Rational explanation. "Give him a reason," "Talk it over with him," "Explain it to him."
03 Request (mild or polite). "Ask politely," "With good manners," "With patience."
04 Request (strong or with follow up). "Ask and then tell if ask is not effective."
05 Directive, tell or order. "Tell him," "Tell him to do whatever it is."
06 Demand, tell plus threat or actual punishment. "I tell him and if that don't get it, get out the strap."
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

46. HOW DOES HE RESPOND TO THIS? 71-72

01 Does it, unqualified or with positive qualification
02 Does it eventually or similar qualification. "He discusses but generally does what he is told," "He procrastinates," "He fools around," "Usually does it," "Generally does it."
03 Situational, it depends on the situation or the task. "Depends on the day, sometimes he does it and sometimes not."
04 Complains or argues but does it. "Complains a bit but will get it done."
05 Emotional response but then does it. "He gets mad but he'll do it."
06 Tries to get others to do it, tries to get out of it.
07 Refuses to do it
08 Reaction to method of correction used with no mention of compliance. "Appreciates it."
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

CARD 2
COL
73-74

47. WHAT FOLLOW-UP IS NEEDED TO SEE THAT HE DOES IT?

Method of follow-up is coded. Frequency or intensity should be coded 91.

01 Nothing, parent abdication. "I just don't," "Doesn't do any good."
02 Nothing, unqualified not necessary. "None," "He always obeys," "is not necessary."

03 Remind him, check to see if it is done. "Encourage him to do it."
04 Explanation. "Explain why he must do it."
05 Nag or persistent reminding. "Insist he do it."
06 Emotional appeal. "Get on my knees and plead," "If you love your mother, you will....."
07 Reward or praise
08 Punishment or threat
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

48. IF YOU SEE THAT HE IS NOT DOING A JOB THE RIGHT WAY, WHAT DO YOU DO? 75-76

01 It does not happen or parent accepts child's way of doing it.
02 Instruction, e.g., demonstrate, correction, explain, tell
03 Maintenance of standard of performance with no correction. "Make him do it over," "Give him opportunity to re-do it," "Make him figure it out himself."
04 Yell, bawl-out, tell off
05 Punish, including physical punishment
06 Parent does it. "Do it myself."
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

49. HOW DOES HE REACT TO THIS?

01 Positive acceptance. "Tries to improve," "Likes to learn easier ways."
02 Neutral acceptance. "He'll do it." Simple acceptance, positive acceptance must be clearly stated to be coded.
03 Negative acceptance. "Grumbles but does it."
04 Refusal. "He goes ahead and does it his own way anyhow," "Says do it yourself then."
05 Emotion reaction only (acceptance not implied). "Gets upset," He laughs.

CARD 2
COL

06 Justifies or rationalizes. "Explained his method."
08 Situational. "Depends on the mood she is in," "Depends on what it is."
91 Other relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate. Parent does nothing.
99 No information

---

50. WHAT JOBS OR CHORES DOES HE HAVE AROUND THE HOUSE?

This question is coded in two parts: 50A is coded according to the Demographic code, and is coded for both the first and second responses given. Where several tasks are mentioned which fall into one category count these as one category only. Score the same way as the Demographic code was used in each country, i.e., if 09 "Exercising pets" was used as any care of pets or if 07 "Shoe cleaning" was used as any care of own clothes, use this same scoring for parent interview. For any coding difficulty or problem, refer to Demographic coding manual. 50B is coded for the context in which the chore is performed.

CARD 3
COL
13-16

50A. Job or chores, Demographic code, score first two responses

01 Bed making
02 Dishwashing
03 Washing windows
04 Cleaning house
05 Laundry
06 Car washing
07 Shoe cleaning
08 Gardening
09 Exercising pets
10 Cooking
11 Caring for younger children
12 Help parents generally
13 Seldom helps, does very little
14 Helps only when forced to do so
15 None
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

CARD 3
COL
17-18

50B. Context in which chore is performed

01 Care of personal items only. "Keeps his room up."
02 Help with family only. "Dishes," "Mows yard"
03 Personal items and family. "Keeps his room up, helps with the dishes."
91 Other
95 Irrelevant
97 Appropriate, has no chores
99 No information

---

51. WHAT ARE THE REASONS FOR HIS HAVING THEM? 19-20

01 To help or assist parents, whether or not necessity is mentioned. "Wife can't do it all," "To help out."
02 Duty, has to be done, because I tell him to, to get the work done. "It has to be done."
03 To teach responsibility. "Good for personality development, learn to be responsible."
04 To learn skills or qualities (excluding responsibility)
05 Likes to or wants to do it
06 Share with the family, cooperate. "Be a part of the family."
07 To keep the child occupied, giving him something to do. "Keep out of trouble."
91 Other
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no chores
99 No information

---

52. HOW OFTEN DO YOU HAVE TO SEE THAT HE DOES THEM? 21-22

01 Always
02 Frequently
03 Sometimes
04 Seldom
05 Never
97 Not appropriate, has no chores
99 No information

---

53. DOES HE TRY TO GET OTHERS TO DO THEM FOR HIM? 23-24

01 No
02 No (qualified), no one else to get, wouldn't let anyone else do them
03 Yes-siblings
04 Yes - parents

05 Yes - peers
06 Yes - unspecified or other than 03-05
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no chores
99 No information

---

54. HOW WELL DOES HE DO THEM? 25-26

01 Excellent
02 Good
03 Satisfactory
04 Poor
05 Very poor
97 Not appropriate, has no chores
99 No information

---

55. HOW OFTEN DOES X HELP AROUND THE HOUSE WITHOUT BEING ASKED? 27-28

01 Always
02 Frequently
03 Sometimes
04 Seldom
91 Other
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

QUESTIONS 56-62 (READ ENTIRE SECTION BEFORE SCORING QUESTIONS)

Score 56, 57, and 60 for Mother, 58, 59, and 61 for Father.

56. HOW DO YOU USUALLY DISCIPLINE OR PUNISH X? 29-30

Always code responses for mother in this column. This question and the following ones frequently elicited complex or compound statements with two or three different elements. Score only the first or dominant response.

01 None. "I don't, he does not need it," "His father handles it."
02 Discussion, rational means. "Explain the situation and what we expect of him."
03 Praise including nonverbal or material rewards
04 Verbal (mild), e.g., scold, nag, disapprove
05 Verbal (strong) with emotion or affect, e.g., yell, bawl-out
06 Threat

07 Deprivation (of privileges) outings, pocket money, etc.
08 Deprivation (of movement) confine to room or house
09 Physical (mild) socially accepted within each country "spank."
10 Physical (strong) all punishments other than spanking or forms which are not socially acceptable within each country. "Beat him," "Strap him."
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

57. WHAT DOES HE DO (in response to punishment mentioned in 56) 31-34

Always code responses for mother in these columns.
Score first two responses.

01 Takes well, corrects behavior, accepts
02 Apologizes
03 No overt reaction, quiet
04 Grumbles, complains, pouts, sulks
05 Withdraw, goes to room, listen to T.V. or radio
06 Cry, sad, sorry
07 Angry, mad
08 Hostile nonverbal behavior
09 Shout, argue, talk back
10 Discuss, present his view
11 Situational
89 Repetition
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, not disciplined or punished
99 No information

---

58. HOW DOES HIS FATHER/MOTHER USUALLY DISCIPLINE OR PUNISH X? 35-36

Always code responses for father in this column.

01 None. "I don't, he does not need it," "His mother handles it."
02 Discussion, rational means. "Explains the situation and what we expect of him."
03 Praise, etc., including also nonverbal or material rewards
04 Verbal (mild), scold, nag, disapprove
05 Verbal (strong) with emotion or affect, yell, bawl out
06 Threat
07 Deprivation (of privileges) outings, pocket money

CARD 3
COL

08 Deprivation (of movement) confine to room or house
09 Physical (mild), spank, socially accepted in country
10 Physical (strong) all punishment other than spanking or forms which are not socially acceptable within each country. "Beat him," "Strap him."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

59. WHAT DOES X DO? (In response to punishment mentioned in 58) 37-40

Always code responses for fathers in these columns. Score first two responses.

01 Takes well, corrects behavior, accepts
02 Apologizes
03 No overt reaction, quiet
04 Grumbles, complains, pouts, sulks
05 Withdraw, goes to room, listen to T.V. or radio
06 Cry, sad, sorry
07 Angry, mad
08 Hostile verbal behavior
09 Shout, argue, talk back
10 Discuss, present his view
11 Situational
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, not disciplined or punished
99 No information

QUESTIONS 60-61

Mother scored for 60 and father for 61.

60. HOW DOES HE REACT WHEN YOU CRITICIZE HIM? 41-42

Always code responses for mother in this column

01 Positive acceptance. "Very good," "Well," "Tries to improve."
02 Apologizes
03 Quiet
04 Ashamed, remorse, humiliated, gets hurt

05 Sulks, pouts
06 Withdraws
07 Cries
08 Gets mad
09 Humor, laughs it off
10 Defensive verbal, e.g., makes excuses, argues, talks back
11 Verbal rational. "Discusses it with me."
12 Non-acceptance: won't take or ignores. "Doesn't pay any attention," "Doesn't take."
13 Situational
14 I don't criticize

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

61. HOW DOES HE REACT WHEN HIS FATHER/MOTHER CRITICIZES HIM? 43-44

Always code responses for father in this column

01 Positive acceptance. "Very good," "Well," "Tries to improve."
02 Apologizes
03 Quiet
04 Ashamed, remorse, humiliated, gets hurt
05 Sulks, pouts
06 Withdraws
07 Cries
08 Gets mad
09 Humor, laughs it off
10 Defensive verbal, makes excuses, argues, talks back
11 Verbal rational. "Discusses."
12 Non-acceptance, won't take or ignores. "Doesn't pay any attention," "Doesn't take."
13 Situational
14 He doesn't criticize

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

62. HOW DOES HE REACT WHEN HIS BROTHERS AND SISTERS OR OTHER CHILDREN CRITICIZE HIM? 45-46

01 Positive acceptance - pays attention, accepts it
02 Doesn't react - is quiet, ignores, doesn't bother him

CARD 3
COL

03 Mild reaction - fusses, cries, gets hurt, talks back, argues
04 Strong reaction - verbal shouts, quarrels, physical fights. "Gets mad."
05 Withdrawal - goes to room, outside
06 "Defensive" reaction - laughs it off, wisecracks. "Superior attitude taken."
08 Is not criticized

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

QUESTIONS 63-68 (READ ENTIRE SECTION BEFORE SCORING QUESTIONS)

63. DOES X HAVE A REGULAR JOB OR WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME? 47-48

This code is the same as used with the Demographic questionnaire.

01 No
02 Yes - no further information
03 Yes - shop work, sales clerk, stock clerk
04 Yes - housework
05 Yes - gardening
06 Yes - farm
07 Yes - with equipment or machines
08 Yes - paper delivery (boys) - baby sitting (girls)

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

64. HOW DOES HE FEEL ABOUT HIS JOB? 49-50

01 Positive feelings. "Likes it a lot."
02 Neutral. "O.K., seems all right."
03 Negative. "Doesn't like it but does it for the money."

93 Don't know how he feels
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no job outside the home
99 No information

CARD 3
COL
51-52

65. WHY DOES HE WORK?

01 Economic (family situation). "To help out."
02 Economic (child). "For extra pocket money," "Saving for college."
03 Likes doing the job
04 Parental pressure or encouragement. "It's good for him to learn."

91 Other, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no job outside the home
99 No information

---

66. HOW DID HE GET HIS JOB? 53-54

01 Self-initiated
02 Through family member. "Father got it for him."
03 Was asked to do it, it was offered to him. "He used to mow grandmother's lawn, the neighbors asked him to do theirs also."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no job outside the home
99 No information

---

67. HOW HARD DOES HE WORK AT HIS JOB? 55-56

01 Hard, steady, conscientiously
02 Not very hard

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no job outside the home
99 No information

---

68. DOES HE ASK FOR HELP WHEN HE RUNS INTO PROBLEMS OR DIFFICULTIES ON THE JOB? 57-58

01 No. "No, does not have any."
02 Yes
03 Yes - qualified

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable

CARD 3
COL

93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no job outside the home
99 No information

---

69. WHAT PARTICULAR TYPE OF JOB OR OCCUPATION WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE X TAKE UP WHEN HE IS GROWN? 59-60

Code responses according to the country-specific Demographic code where possible. Note that there are separate codes for males and females. Use codes 09 through 12 only when the status level for the occupation cannot be assigned.

Same as "Occupations at the six status levels" plus supplements (country-specific)

Male

01 Medical Doctor, Lawyer, University Professor, Big Business Manager, Government Department Head
02 Accountant, High School Teacher, Army Captain, Office Manager, Insurance Agent
03 Traveling Salesman, Bank Clerk, Army Sergeant, Owner of Grocery Store, Bookkeeper
04 Carpenter, Mechanic, Restaurant Cook, Electrician, Shop Clerk
05 Factory Worker, Truck Driver, Waiter, Barber, Soldier
06 Janitor, Street Sweeper, Dock Worker, Day Laborer, Night Watchman

Female

01 Medical Doctor, Lawyer, University Professor, Big Business Manager, Government Department Head
02 Accountant, High School Teacher, Social Worker, Dress Designer, Insurance Saleswoman
03 Trained Nurse, Bank Clerk, Primary School Teacher, Laboratory Technician, Secretary
04 Typist, Dress Maker, Restaurant Cook, Telephone Operator, Shop Clerk
05 Factory Worker, Usher in Theatre, Hospital Attendant, Waitress, Beauty Operator
06 Domestic Servant, Baby Sitter, Laundry Worker, Dishwasher, Washroom Attendant
08 Housewife

09 Child's preference. Whatever the child desires, parent will not interfere

CARD 3
COL

10 Child's welfare. Whatever will make the child happy, fulfill the child
11 No preference, have not thought about it
12 Anything decent or moral

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

70. WHAT TYPE OF JOB OR OCCUPATION WOULD YOU NOT LIKE TO SEE X TAKE UP WHEN HE IS GROWN? 61-62

01 No restrictions. "Never thought about it, no job that I will not want him to do."
02 Particular profession, architect, minister, lawyer, etc.
03 Low status job (excluding moral consideration). "Common labor."
04 Specific occupation not covered in 02-03, secretary, midwife, etc.
05 Any job not suited to temperament of child or not in keeping with regard to his capacity or abilities
06 Immoral or illegal activities. "Prostitute," "Dance hall girl," "Cheap entertainer."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

71. WHAT TYPE OF WORK DO YOU FEEL X WOULD LIKE TO DO WHEN HE GROWS UP? 63-64

Male

01 Medical Doctor, Lawyer, University Professor, Big Business Manager, Government Department Head
02 Accountant, High School Teacher, Army Captain, Office Manager, Insurance Agent
03 Traveling Salesman, Bank Clerk, Army Sergeant, Owner of Grocery Store, Bookkeeper
04 Carpenter, Mechanic, Restaurant Cook, Electrician, Shop Clerk
05 Factory Worker, Truck Driver, Waiter, Barber, Soldier
06 Janitor, Street Sweeper, Dock Worker, Day Laborer, Night Watchman

Female

01 Medical Doctor, Lawyer, University Professor, Big Business Manager, Government Department Head
02 Accountant, High School Teacher, Social Worker, Dress Designer, Insurance Saleswoman
03 Trained Nurse, Bank Clerk, Primary School Teacher, Laboratory Technician, Secretary
04 Typist, Dress Maker, Restaurant Cook, Telephone Operator, Shop Clerk
05 Factory Worker, Usher in Theatre, Hospital Attendant, Waitress, Beauty Operator
06 Domestic Servant, Baby Sitter, Laundry Worker, Dishwasher, Washroom Attendant
08 Housewife

09 No preference, has not thought about it

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

72. WHAT TYPE OF WORK DO YOU FEEL X PROBABLY WILL DO WHEN HE GROWS UP? 65-66

Male

01 Medical Doctor, Lawyer, University Professor, Big Business Manager, Government Head
02 Accountant, High School Teacher, Army Captain, Office Manager, Insurance Agent
03 Traveling Salesman, Bank Clerk, Army Sergeant, Owner of Grocery Store, Bookkeeper
04 Carpenter, Mechanic, Restaurant Cook, Electrician, Shop Clerk
05 Factory Worker, Truck Driver, Waiter, Barber, Soldier
06 Janitor, Street Sweeper, Dock Worker, Day Laborer, Night Watchman

Female

01 Medical Doctor, Lawyer, University Professor, Big Business Manager, Government Department Head
02 Accountant, High School Teacher, Social Worker, Dress Designer, Insurance Saleswoman
03 Trained Nurse, Bank Clerk, Primary School Teacher, Laboratory Technician, Secretary

04 Typist, Dress Maker, Restaurant Cook, Telephone Operator, COL
Shop Clerk
05 Factory Worker, Usher in Theatre, Hospital Attendant, Waitress, Beauty Operator
06 Domestic Servant, Baby Sitter, Laundry Worker, Dishwasher, Washroom Attendant
08 Housewife

09 No preference, has not thought about it

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

73. CHILDREN ARE DIFFERENT IN HOW THEY GET ALONG WITH OTHER CHILDREN. HOW DOES X GET ALONG WITH OTHER CHILDREN?

This question is coded in two parts. 73A is to record the parents evaluation of how well the child gets along with other children. 73B is descriptive of the child's behavior with other children.

73A. Parent's evaluation 67-68

01 Very well, excellent
02 Average (friendly)
03 Not very well, poorly

93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

73B. Child's behavior 69-70

01 Assertive - leader, bossy, dominating, opinionated
02 Not assertive - follower, shy, self-conscious
03 Has a temper
04 Gregarious, likes company
05 Independent. "Stands up for himself," "Pretty independent."
06 Changes his friends often
07 Very few friends. "Not many friends."
08 Very close or long time friends. "One or two close friends."
09 No friends. "A loner."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

CARD 3
COL

74. WHAT DO YOU DO TO HELP X GET ALONG WITH OTHER CHILDREN? 71-72

01 Nothing
02 Encourage social activity. "Serve things for his friends." "Take them on outings," "Welcome his friends in our home."
03 Training; positive approach, encouraging certain personal behavior. "Tell him to be friendly."
04 Training; negative approach, discouraging certain behaviors. "Don't fight," "Don't be so bossy."
05 Training, both positive and negative or training unspecified. "I give him advice."
06 Whatever we can
07 Punishment. "Punish him for egotistic behavior."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

75. IN WHAT WAYS DO X'S FRIENDS INFLUENCE HIS BEHAVIOR? 73-74

01 Deny, no influence. "They don't"
02 General influence, good. "I approve of his friends."
03 General acknowledgment of influence, neither good nor bad.
04 General influence - bad.
05 Specific influences such as hair fashion, social habits. "What they play."
06 Influences others but is not influenced himself

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

76. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THIS? (Friends influences described in 75). 75-76

01 Positive. "I approve of her friends," "I think it's O.K."
02 Ambivalent, conditional, situational. "Depends," "I don't mind as long as there are limits."
03 Neutral. "Must be so," "It's inevitable," "I don't care."
04 Negative. "I disapprove," "Don't think it is too good."
05 Approves lack of influence. "Glad he is independent." Approves influence on others.
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

CARD 4
COL
11-12

77. WHEN X GETS WORRIED WHAT DOES HE DO ABOUT IT?

This question relates directly to Sentence Completion Stem No. 23.

01 Talking about the worry with someone else
02 Depressed or anxious affect. The anxious affective responses are often essentially repetitions of the stem. "Gets upset," "Really gets worried," "Gets sad," "Feels depressed," "Feels bad," "He cries."
03 Attempts to cope with the worry by goal-directed thinking or action oriented toward solving the problem. "Thinks about it," "Asks himself what's wrong," "Tries to figure out what happened," "Does something about it."
04 Tries to remain calm, forgets about the worry, or indulges in some activity designed to forget about or minimize the worry. "Tries to be calm," "Tries to forget about it," "Walks around to calm down," "Whistles."
05 All ambiguous responses that imply a complete loss of control when the subject is worried. "He panics," "Does foolish things," "Completely goes to pieces."
06 Withdraws from the physical situation with no other action or affect expressed. "Goes to room," "Leaves."
07 Specific behaviors that he indulges in when worried. These behaviors are not goal-directed actions designed to solve the problem but are overt reactions to the worry. "Bites his nails," "Eats a piece of sugar," "Plays with a piece of string."
08 All physiological or involuntary responses. "Trembles," "Gets an upset stomach," "Can't sleep."
09 A lack of action or of affect of any sort. "Doesn't talk," "Doesn't do anything," "Just sits there."
10 Hostile affect or action as a reaction to worry. "Gets mad," "Becomes very angry."
11 All responses mentioning the outcome to the situation causing the worry, or focusing on the future in some manner. "Finds it turns out all right in the end," "Hopes for the best," "Tries to look on the good side."
12 Not displaying his feelings or keeping them to himself. This response differs from 04 in that there is no mention of trying to stay calm, this is only to prevent the open display of feelings. "Keeps it to himself," "Doesn't tell anyone."
13 Doesn't worry. "Doesn't worry much."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

CARD 4
COL

78. WHAT KINDS OF THINGS DOES HE WORRY ABOUT? 13-14

This question was intended to parallel the Sentence Completion Stem No. 28 but the coding does not transfer directly.

01 Death
02 War
03 Physical health
04 Academic problems, homework, grades, school conditions or quality of instruction
05 Youth problems, peer relationships. "Getting fat," "Hair or clothes," "Making the team."
06 Family problems other than health. "Money," "Things she can't have, we can't afford."
07 Self concern, his own behavior, misbehavior, faults, future, being punished, change in environment
08 Institutions, political situations, religion

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no worries
99 No information

79. HOW DO YOU TELL WHEN X IS WORRIED? 15-16

01 Can't tell
02 Discussion. "Talks it over," "Says he is," "Complains to me."
03 Hyper-active, talks more
04 Hypo-active, talks less, stays in room more
05 Appearance (excluding level of activity), pale facial expression, way of manner of talking
06 Loses his temper at siblings
07 Nervousness, involuntary reactions, bites nails, fidgets, nausea

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no worries
99 No information

80. WHEN HE HAS WORRIES DOES HE TURN TO OTHERS FOR HELP? 17-20

In some cases it may be necessary to obtain the information to code this question from 77, 79, or 81. This question relates to the Sentence Completion item numbers 10 and 23

Do not include responses where parent sees child is worried and offers help, the question is "Does he turn to others?" Score both first and second responses to the question.

01 No
02 Yes - unspecified
03 Yes - mother
04 Yes - father
05 Yes - parents
06 Yes - other relations
07 Yes - siblings
08 Yes - peers
09 Yes - teacher
10 Others, God, minister, neighbor

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no worries
99 No information

---

81. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY ADVISE X TO DO WHEN HE IS WORRIED? 21-22

01 Support, reassurance, "Tell him not to worry," "Tell him we'll take care of it."
02 Direct action at source. "Talk to the teacher if school basis," "Work it out."
03 Face or accept the inevitability of the situation. "Accept it," "There is nothing you can do about it."
04 Seek religious solace
05 Tension reduction. "Go for a walk," "Keep busy."
06 Ambiguous responses (ambivalent). "It depends on the problem, I analyze it."
07 No advice given. "I don't."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, has no worries
99 No information

---

82. WHAT KINDS OF THINGS MAKE X ANGRY? 23-26

83. WHAT ELSE BESIDES HIS BROTHERS AND SISTERS MAKE HIM ANGRY?

Regard 82 and 83 as one question. Score first two responses.

01 Petty annoyances inflicted upon him by others, usually peers, of the type that practically all children are exposed to

often and would not be considered serious grievances. "Someone picks on him," "His brother comes in his room," "His brother bosses him," "Someone calls him bad names."

02 Other's treatment of him that is of a more serious or long-lasting nature. Include behaviors considered "wrong" in a moral or ethical sense. "People are cruel to him," "He's taken advantage of," "He's cheated or lied to."

03 His behavior is controlled by the parents (or other authority figures) either by (a) not being allowed to do something that he wants to do, or (b) being forced to do something that he does not want to do. "Has to do dishes," "Has to practice the piano," "Can't go to the show," "He doesn't get what he wants."

04 The subject's own behavior is the cause of the anger. Do not include in this category responses relating to school failure or poor performance in school. "Does something bad," "Breaks something," "Gets into trouble."

05 In essence, repetitions of the question, "Get mad," "Someone makes him mad."

06 Parental (or other authority figures) punishment or scolding. "When he gets a whipping," "When bawled out by parents." "Criticism."

07 Being unjustly or unfairly accused of something that he claims (or at least implies) to be innocent of. "People say she's doing wrong and she's not," "Someone calls him a liar."

08 Mistreatment of other people (or animals) by someone. Specifies that the anger-producing behavior is specifically the mistreatment of one living thing by another without mentioning himself as the victim or the aggressor. "Sees someone mistreated," "Someone hurts one of the family," "Someone is cruel to a dog."

09 Poor academic performance is the cause of anger. "Fails a test," "Makes bad grades," "Makes careless mistakes on a test."

10 Annoying behavior or undesirable characteristics of another person. "People are hypocritical and snobbish," "Someone does something idiotic," "My parents have an argument," "The younger generation is criticized."

11 The source of anger is in things or events completely unspecified. "Something goes wrong," "Things do not go his way," "Something happens."

12 Behavior of others that violates some personal or idiosyncratic, political, religious or other type of belief system. "People knock our country," "People demonstrate against Vietnam," "LBJ says something," "He sees a form of segregation."

13 Never or seldom gets angry

14 Siblings, e.g., brothers and/or sisters*
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

84. WHAT DOES X USUALLY DO WHEN HE GETS ANGRY? 27-28

01 Withdraws from the situation. "Goes to room," "Leaves the house," "Has to be by himself."
02 Hostile or aggressive affect, but there is no action indicated. "Sulks and pouts," "Is grouchy," "Gets mad," "Blows up," "Gets really angry."
03 Attempts to prevent the overt expression of his anger, controls the anger, or indulges in activities designed to control or overcome the anger. "Tries to calm down," "Tries not to show it," "Counts to 10."
04 Verbal expression of hostility, or one may infer that the hostility is expressed verbally. "Curses someone out," "Tells them he's mad," "Lets them know how he feels," "Talks back."
05 Depressed or anxious affect, or intropunative hostility. "Cries," "Gets sad," "Feels terrible," "Gets very upset," "Gets mad at himself."
06 Physical aggression (or desire to be aggressive physically) against another person, animal, or inanimate object. "Starts a fight," "Beats someone up," "Wants to fight someone," "Kicks the wall," "Throws something," "Takes it out on the dog."
07 Physiological or involuntary reactions. "Trembles," "Turns red," "Shakes all over."
08 No action or affect of any sort, or where the response is stated in the negative. "Doesn't speak," "Sits on the sofa doing nothing," "Forgets it," "Doesn't mind."
09 Attempts to cope actively with the source of the problem or anger-producing situation. "Just tries to face the problem," "Does something about it," "Stands up for his rights," "Thinks fast and accurate."
10 Seeks help from others

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, never or seldom gets angry
99 No information

---

*Use this code only when response cannot be coded in one of the other categories.

CARD 4
COL
29-30

85. WHAT DOES X USUALLY DO WHEN HE GETS ANGRY AT YOU?

85 is always coded for mother and 86 for father.

01 Withdraws, leaves the physical situation. "Goes away," "Leaves the room," "Goes to his room."
02 The control of affect and/or behavior is either specified or implied. Attempts either not to become angry or to control any anger that is felt. "Tries to control his feelings," "Calms down," "Doesn't show it," "Takes it well," "Counts to 10."
03 All negative depressive emotional reactions. "Feels sad," "Feels bad," "Cries."
04 All negative hostile emotional reactions with no action. "Really gets mad," "Very angry," "Furious," "Sulks and pouts," "Hates them."
05 No action or affect mentioned or implied. These are primarily responses of complete inaction or responses stating only what is not done. "Does nothing," "Just sits there," "Just listens," "Doesn't speak," "Doesn't sulk or pout."
06 Verbal aggression against the parents is either specified or strongly implied. "Tells us how mad he is," "Tells me off," "Talks back," "Curse me," "Let me know how he feels," "Yells."
07 Attempts to resolve the misunderstanding or difficulty by either (a) talking about it with the parents, or (b) thinking about the behavior to try to understand what was done wrong or what should have been done. "Thinks about what he has done," "Talks to parents about it," "Explains his side," "Wonders what he could do to keep it from happening again."
08 Behavioral rebellion or overt negative behavior that doesn't appear to be primarily verbal. "Doesn't obey," "Does something to make us mad," "Throws a temper tantrum," "Revolts," "Refuses to eat."
09 Submission and/or acceptance of blame with respect to the parent's attitude. "Obeys anyway," "Forgives," "Apologizes," "Understands," "Loves us even more because it is for her own benefit," "Repents."
10 Withdrawal of affection
11 Need of affection

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable, "Doesn't get angry at me."
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, never or seldom gets angry as response to 82.
99 No information

CARD 4
COL
31-32

86. WHAT DOES X USUALLY DO WHEN HE GETS ANGRY AT HIS FATHER/MOTHER?

86 is always coded for father

01 Withdraws, leaves the physical situation. "Goes away," "Leaves the room," "Goes to his room."
02 The control of affect and/or behavior is either specified or implied. Attempts either not to become angry or to control any anger that is felt. "Tries to control his feelings," "Calms down," "Doesn't show it," "Takes it well," "Counts to 10."
03 All negative depressive emotional reactions. "Feels sad," "Feels bad," "Cries."
04 All negative hostile emotional reactions with no action. "Really gets mad," "Very angry," "Furious," "Sulks and pouts," "Hates them."
05 No action or affect mentioned or implied. These are primarily responses of complete inaction or responses stating only what is not done. "Does nothing," "Just sits there," "Just listens," "Doesn't speak," "Doesn't sulk or pout."
06 Verbal aggression against the parents is either specified or strongly implied. "Tells us how mad he is," "Tells me off," "Talks back," "Curse me," "Let me know how he feels," "Yells."
07 Attempts to resolve the misunderstanding or difficulty by either (a) talking about it with the parents, or (b) thinking about the behavior to try to understand what was done wrong or what should have been done. "Thinks about what he has done," "Talks to parents about it," "Explains his side," "Wonders what he could do to keep it from happening again."
08 Behavioral rebellion or overt negative behavior that doesn't appear to be primarily verbal. "Doesn't obey," "Does something to make us mad," "Throws a temper tantrum," "Revolts," "Refuses to eat."
09 Submission and/or acceptance of blame with respect to the parent's attitude. "Obeys anyway," "Forgives," "Apologizes," "Understands," "Loves us even more because it is for her own benefit," "Repents."
10 Withdrawal of affection
11 Need of affection

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, never or seldom gets angry as response to 82
99 No information

CARD 4
COL

87. WHAT DOES X USUALLY DO WHEN A FRIEND IS ANGRY AT HIM? 33-34

Scored same as Sentence Completion Stem No. 34

01 Behavior on his part designed to resolve the difficulties with the friend or to maintain or reinstate the friendship. "Tries to find out why," "Tries to make up with him," "Tries to get her to play," "Calls them up and invites them over."
02 Not reacting, doing nothing, or ignoring the friend. "Ignores him," "Does nothing," "Doesn't get mad," "Becomes silent."
03 Hostile emotional reaction toward the situation or friend with no other action. "Gets mad at them too," "Is angry also."
04 Leaving the friend's presence. "Goes away," "Goes home."
05 Depressed or anxious affect. "Feels very sad," "Wants to cry," "Gets very upset."
06 Simple acceptance of the friend's anger. "Takes it well," "Accepts him."
07 Hostile verbal or physical action or the desire to indulge in some hostile action toward the friend. "Hits them," "Thumps them," "Fights him," "Knocks his block off," "Tells her off," "Wants to hit them."
08 Finds (or attempts to find) other friends to play with. "Finds new ones," "Gets another friend," "Plays with another."
10 Denial. "Don't think they do."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

88. WHAT DOES X USUALLY DO WHEN SOMEONE HURTS HIS FEELINGS? 35-36

Scored same as Sentence Completion Stem No. 32

01 Ignores, does not react toward, or withdraws from the person who did the hurting. "Leaves them alone," "Goes away from them," "Pays no attention to them," "Does nothing," "Gets quiet."
02 Negative depressed or anxious affect with no other action. "Cries," "Feels so sad," "Feels terrible," "Becomes very upset," "Gets nervous."
03 Hostile affect with no other action. "Gets mad," "Is very angry at them."
04 A "stoical" acceptance attitude toward his feelings being hurt. The main difference between category 01 and this

category is that there is an implication here that the individual's feelings have actually been hurt, but that he tries to accept it, whereas in 01 one cannot necessarily infer that the subject's feelings have been hurt. "Tries to stand it," "Takes it," "Doesn't cry."

05 Verbal hostility toward the source of the hurt feelings. "Tell them what he thinks of them," "Curses them out."
06 Attempts to cope by thinking about or trying to understand why other persons hurt his feelings. "Tries to figure out what happened," "Wonders why they did it."
07 Physical aggression, hostile reaction (nonverbal) or the desire to engage in physical aggression toward the source of the hurt feelings. "Beats him," "Uses violence," "Thumps them," "Would like to beat them."
08 A physiological or involuntary reaction. "Normally goes red," "Trembles."
09 Attempt to cope with the situation by reacting in a positive manner toward the other person, discussing the situation with him, or trying to convince the other person not to do what he has done.
10 Turns to others
11 Doesn't happen

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

85. DIFFERENT PEOPLE FEEL DIFFERENT THINGS ARE IMPORTANT. WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE IMPORTANT THINGS A CHILD SHOULD LEARN AS A PERSON, AS HE IS GROWING UP? 37-40

Score first two responses

01 Religious values
02 Social graces, good manners, culture, tact
03 Social values - getting along with others, respecting others' points of view, tolerance, not making trouble for others, helping other people
04 Positive personal characteristics, attributes, or values - honesty, truthfulness, independence, responsibility
05 Materialistic values - value of money
06 Specific skills, music, housework, etc.
07 Citizenship, respect law, etc.
08 Sexual education and guidance
09 Mental health, understanding self, having a goal, personal happiness, able to live with himself
10 Value of education

11 Importance of family, respect for parents and elders
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

90. HAVE YOU TAKEN ANY COURSES OR TRAINING SINCE YOU LEFT SCHOOL? 41-44

Code only two, starting with the most recent and going back.

01 No
02 Yes - professional, technical, vocational
03 Yes - intellectual, could lead to a degree
04 Yes - intellectual, short term, a literature class, language class, etc.
05 Yes - recreational, flower arranging, hobby, etc.
06 Yes - domestic, cooking, sewing, etc.
07 Yes - service, first aid, how to teach Sunday School, etc.
89 Repetition of earlier response
91 Yes - others not classifiable above
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

91. WHY DID YOU TAKE THEM? 45-46

01 Economic press, vocational preparation, maintenance or improvement
02 Personal or family usefulness. "A person should know how to," "I want to be able to," "To help the family."
03 Social usefulness, Red Cross or Sunday School
04 Improvement, self, "I wanted to know more about it."
05 Personal satisfaction, interest, distraction. "Something to do to get out of the house," "To meet people," "Because I like them."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
97 Not appropriate, has taken no courses since school
99 No information

---

92. WHEN DID YOU TAKE IT (THEM)? 47-48

01 Shortly after school - when single, when young, before family, or over ten years ago
02 Between 5 and 10 years ago
03 Within last 4 years, but not at present
04 At present

05 Over a long period (several courses). Some long ago, some at present

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
97 Not appropriate, has taken no courses since school
99 No information

---

93. DID YOU COMPLETE THEM? 49-50

01 No - completed none of them
02 Completed some of them
03 Yes - completed all of them

97 Not appropriate, has taken no courses since school
99 No information

---

94. DO YOU FEEL YOU GAINED FROM IT? 51-52

01 No
02 Yes

97 Not appropriate, has taken no courses since school
99 No information

---

95. YOU SAID YOU WERE A__________________, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW YOU CAME TO BE IN THIS KIND OF WORK? 53-54

The main dimension here is how the father (or working mother) came to be in this particular field of work rather than the specific job he has at the time. Take the information for this dimension from wherever it may be found in this section.

01 Wanted this type of work, "I became an apprentice," I felt I would be qualified or good at it."
02 Convenience - time and/or location. "Close to home," "Same hours as children," "Work in home."
03 External factors, accident, necessity to change work
04 Family trade or family pressure
05 Through friends or others
06 No particular reason. "I just applied, sort of fell into it," "Walked into it," "Just drifted into it."
07 Not working or housewife
08 Financial returns of this particular field of work.
91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

CARD 4
COL
55-56

96. WHAT IS YOUR JOB LIKE?

The responses to this question are coded only as descriptive or evaluative responses.

01 Descriptive; describes some aspect of the work. "Keep books," "Sell machinery."
02 Evaluative. "It is a good job," "It pays well."

91 Other, not classifiable
97 Not appropriate, not working or housewife
99 No information

---

97. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT IT? 57-58

01 Positive affect. "I like it."
02 Neutral or ambivalent
03 Negative affect. "Don't like it much."

93 Don't know
97 Not appropriate, not working or housewife
99 No information

---

98. WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT IT? 59-60

These categories are based on the occupational values presented on cards in question 110 and on those in the Occupational Values Inventory.

01 Interesting things, challenging
02 Different things, variety, unique or rare types of occupations
03 Nice place to work, good location
04 Security
05 Service, helping other people
06 Leader, authority
07 Self-expression, creative or artistic
08 Money
09 Advancement, a chance to get ahead
10 Independence, a chance to be on your own
11 Being with people you like, nice people including boss(es)
12 Accomplishment, doing a job well
13 Special characteristics of the job. "I like to walk on foot," "The finishing and laying out the job."
14 Everything
15 Nothing

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know

95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, not working or housewife
99 No information

---

99. WHAT DO YOU DISLIKE ABOUT IT? 61-62

This coding is in part the negation of the values in 98. In case of difficulty classifying responses, consider which of the values it negates.

01 Boring, dull, little interest, routine
02 Poor condition. "It is too far away," "Too hot here," "Shift work."
03 Insecurity, not very steady, sometimes out of work
04 No responsibility, have to follow orders
05 No self-expression. "I can't use my own ideas."
06 Low pay
07 No opportunity for advancement
08 No self-direction, can't work on own, dependent on others
09 Don't like fellow workers or boss
10 No feeling of accomplishment. "Can't feel you've done anything," "As soon as you get it clean it gets all dirty again."
11 Special characteristics of job. "So much sadness," "Slapped by older patients."
12 Everything
13 Nothing
14 Too much work

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, not working or housewife
99 No information

---

100. WOULD YOU CHOOSE THE SAME KIND OF WORK IF YOU HAD IT TO DO OVER? 63-64

01 No
02 Yes
03 Conditional or uncertain

93 Don't know
97 Not appropriate, not working or housewife
99 No information

---

101. WHEN YOU ARE ON THE JOB AND PROBLEMS COME UP ABOUT THE WORK, WHAT DO YOU DO? 65-66

01 Solve by self. "Work it out," "Look it up in manual."
02 Attempt own solution and then seek help from co-workers
03 Attempt own solution and then seek help from supervisor
04 Seek help from co-workers
05 Seek help from supervisors
06 Seek help from others (wife, friends away from work)
07 Withdraw, leave the field
08 Affective responses
09 Denies problems

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, not working or housewife
99 No information

---

102. WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO GET ALONG WITH YOUR FELLOW WORKERS (COLLEAGUES)? 67-68

01 Not applicable, e.g., works alone
02 Do your work, e.g., pull your own weight, do your share
03 Ignore them
04 Achieve good social relationships, be friendly, kind with them, be yourself, give and take.
05 Tolerance, try to understand them or their point of view, respect them, make allowances for them

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, not working or housewife
99 No information

---

103. WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO GET ALONG WITH YOUR BOSS OR SUPERVISOR? 69-70

01 Not applicable. "I work alone."
02 Do work well or properly, follow instructions, do as told. "Do your work."
03 Do more than is required. "When you see things that need doing, do them."
04 Respect
05 Keep out of way, don't bother him (with little problems)
06 Flattery, yes man, use psychology
91 Other
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, not working or housewife
99 No information

CARD 4
COL

104. WHAT DO YOU THINK OR DO WHEN CRITICIZED? 71-72

01 Rational analysis (including separation of justified from unjustified). "It all depends" statements, reflect upon self
02 Takes well (according to country definition)
03 Ignores, don't care, don't pay any attention, don't listen, get quiet, withdraw
04 Dislikes, gets hurt, depressed
05 Humor, laugh it off, laugh
06 Defensive verbal, make excuses, criticize back, argue "Bawl out," "Tell them off."
07 Rational verbal, interaction, talk it over, discuss it with them
08 Get mad
09 Doesn't happen, never criticized
10 Takes poorly
11 Physical aggressive behavior

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

105. BY HUSBAND/WIFE 73-74

01 Rational analysis (including separation of justified from unjustified). "It all depends" statements, reflect upon self.
02 Takes well (according to country definition)
03 Ignores, don't care, don't pay any attention, don't listen, get quiet, withdraw
04 Dislikes, gets hurt, depressed
05 Humor, laugh it off, laugh
06 Defensive verbal, make excuses, criticize back, argue. "Bawl out," "Tell them off."
07 Rational verbal, interaction, talk it over, discuss it with them
08 Get mad
09 Doesn't happen, not criticized by husband/wife
10 Takes poorly
11 Physical aggressive behavior

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, is never criticized as an answer to 104
99 No information

CARD 4
COL
75-76

106. BY FRIENDS?

01 Rational analysis (including separation of justified from unjustified). "It all depends" statements, reflect upon self
02 Takes well (according to country definition)
03 Ignores, don't care, don't pay any attention, don't listen, get quiet, withdraw
04 Dislikes, gets hurt, depressed
05 Humor, laugh it off, laugh
06 Defensive verbal, make excuses, criticize back, argue. "Bawl out," "Tell them off."
07 Rational verbal, interaction, talk it over, discuss it with them
08 Get mad
09 Doesn't happen, not criticized by friends
10 Takes poorly
11 Physical aggressive behavior

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, is never criticized as an answer to 104
99 No information

CARD 5
COL
11-12

107. BY YOUR OWN CHILDREN?

01 Rational analysis (including separation of justified from unjustified). "It all depends" statements, reflect on oneself
02 Takes well (according to country definition)
03 Ignores. "Don't care," "Don't pay any attention."
04 Dislikes, gets hurt, depressed
05 Humor, laugh it off, laugh
06 Defensive verbal, makes excuses, criticize back. "Bawl out," "Tell them off."
07 Rational verbal, talk it over, discuss it with them
08 Get mad
09 Doesn't happen, not criticized by children
10 Punishment, including physical - scold child, hit them

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable - "Child should not criticize"
93 Don't know
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, is never criticized as an answer to 104
99 No information

CARD 5
COL
13-14

108. WHAT KINDS OF THINGS MAKE YOU ANGRY?

01 Petty annoyances of the type that practically all people are exposed to often and would not be considered serious grievances by most people.

02 Other's treatment that is of a more serious or long-lasting nature. Included here are behaviors that most people would consider "wrong" in a moral or ethical sense. "People are cruel to me," "I am taken advantage of by others," "People mistreat me," "I am cheated or lied to," "Someone breaks a promise to me."

03 The action or event causing the anger originates with the self. The subject's own behavior is the cause of the anger. Do not include responses relating to work failure or poor performance in work. "I do something bad," "I break something," "I do something unsatisfactorily," "I get in trouble."

04 Repetitions or synonyms of the stem. "I get mad," "Someone makes me mad," "When I fight because I'm mad."

05 The source of anger is child. "My children," "The kids, when they don't mind."

06 Being unjustly or unfairly accused of something that he claims (or at least implies) to be innocent of. "People say I'm doing wrong and I'm not," "I'm accused of doing something I didn't do," "Someone calls me a liar and I'm not."

07 The mistreatment of other people (or animals) by someone. The anger-producing behavior is specifically the mistreatment of one living thing by another without mentioning himself as the victim or the aggressor. "I see someone mistreated," "Someone hurts one of my family," "Someone is mean to people," "Someone is cruel to a dog."

08 His own poor work performance is the cause of anger (poor work performance of others code in 14). "I make careless mistakes in working a test."

09 Annoying behavior or undesirable characteristics of another person. "People are hypocritical and snobbish," "I come upon an incompetent idiot," "Someone does something idiotic."

10 Things or events completely unspecified. "Something goes wrong," "Things seem to go wrong," "Things do not go my way," "Something happens."

11 Behavior of others that violates some personal or idiosyncratic, political, religious or other type of belief system. "People knock our country," "People demonstrate against Vietnam," "LBJ says something," "I see a form of seregation."

12 Spouse

13 I don't get angry

CARD 5
COL

14 Work related problems other than own performance. "Someone not doing his share," "When things go wrong at the office."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable, it depends
95 Irrelevant
99 No information

---

109. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY DO WHEN YOU ARE ANGRY? 15-16

01 Withdrawing from the situation apparently causing the anger. "Go to my room," "Leave the house," "Go away as fast as I can," "Have to be by myself."
02 Feeling hostile or aggressive affect, but there is no action indicated. Some of these responses are essentially repetitions of the stem, and others express more passive aggressive affect. "Sulk," "Am grouchy," "Get mad," "Am really angry."
03 Attempting to prevent the overt expression of his anger, controlling the anger, or indulging in activities designed to control or overcome the anger. "Try to calm down," "Try not to show it," "Go try to cool off," "Count to 10."
04 The verbal expression of hostility, or one may infer that the hostility is expressed verbally. "Curse someone out," "Tell them I'm mad," "Let them know how I feel," "Talk back."
05 Depressed or anxious affect, or intropunative hostility. "Cry," "Get sad," "Feel terrible," "Get very upset," "Get mad at myself."
06 Physical aggression (or the desire to aggress physically) against another person, animal, or inanimate object. "Start a fight," "Beat someone up," "Want to fight someone," "Kick the well," "Throw something," "Take it out on my dog."
07 Physiological or involuntary reactions. "Tremble," "Turn red," "Shake all over."
08 No action or affect of any sort, or where his response is stated in the negative. "I don't ...," "Don't speak," "Sit on the sofa doing nothing," "Don't cuss or fuss," "I do nothing." "Forget it," "Don't mind."
09 Attempting to cope actively with the source of the problem or anger-producing situation. "Just try to face the problem," "Do something about it," "Stand up for my rights," "Think fast and accurate."

91 Other, relevant, not classifiable
95 Irrelevant
97 Not appropriate, is never angry
99 No information

CARD 5
COL

110. Enter the rank order of each of the fifteen occupation values, beginning with "do interesting things" and continuing down that column of values. When the rank for "lead other people" is entered, begin on the second column of values with "artist" and continue until finished. Two coding columns are used for each rank, i.e., 01 = rank 1, 02 = rank 2, 03 = rank 3, etc. If no rank is given, enter 99 on the coding sheet. 17-46

POST INTERVIEW RATINGS:

1. WAS OTHER PARENT ALSO INTERVIEWED? 47-48

This information does not appear on the Post Interview Ratings form and must be obtained from other sources.

01 Yes
02 No - refused, objected, personal reasons
03 No - health
04 No - time, too busy
05 No - temporarily away from home
06 No - separated
07 No - not attempted
08 No - other

99 No information

---

3. TOTAL TIME OF INTERVIEW 49-50

01 1-30 min.
02 31-45 min.
03 46-60 min.
04 61-75 min.
05 76-90 min.
06 91-105 min.
07 106-120 min.
08 121-150 min.
09 Over 2 1/2 hours

99 No information

---

4. NUMBER OF CALLS OR ATTEMPTS TO ESTABLISH INTERVIEW 51-52

01 First contact
02 Second call or attempt, appointment from first contact
03 Third call or attempt, or appointment set up at second contact

04 Fourth call or attempt
05 Five or more attempts

99 No information

CARD 5
COL
53-54

5. HOW WAS INTERVIEW ARRANGED OR OBTAINED?

01 Interview completed at first contact
02 Appointment for interview made at first contact
03 Telephone call set up appointment
04 Other

99 No information

QUESTIONS 6-8 PERSON 55-56

6. 01 Talkative
02 Responsive
03 Urging needed
04 Other

99 No information

---

7. 01 Good vocabulary
02 Adequate vocabulary
03 Poor vocabulary

99 No information

---

8. 01 Comfortable 59-60
02 Uncomfortable
03 Tense
04 Other

99 No information

RATING SCALES

The dimensions of each rating scale should be coded in order, i.e., from top to bottom. For each dimension, the space on the left is coded 1, the next space 2, and so on until the last space on the right is coded 5. Note only one column on the coding sheet is provided for each number. Therefore, the space on the far left would be coded 1 (not 01), the next space 2, etc. If none of the spaces on a dimension are marked, leave that column on the scoring sheet blank.

CHILD IN SCHOOL (TASK ACHIEVEMENT) 61-66

CHILD AT HOME (TASK ACHIEVEMENT)	CARD 5 COL 67-72
CHILD OUTSIDE THE HOME (NON-ACADEMIC TASK ACHIEVEMENT)	73-77
CHILD'S HANDLING OF ANXIETY	CARD 6 COL 11-12
PARENT AT WORK (TASK ACHIEVEMENT)	13-17
PARENT-CHILD INTERACTION	18

Two general rules for scaling were made as follows:

1. For all items where the response is represented by a frequency count, and where it is theoretically possible for the subject to obtain a frequency represented by a score greater than 9, no more than 8 responses should be actually coded. Thus a code of 09 would represent a frequency of 8 or more.

2. Following is an example of the procedure for obtaining a total scale score for a given subject across items representing a given behavioral area. The example is given for the child's coping effectiveness in the area of Academic Task Achievement.

   (a) If to Q23 the code is 01, 02, 03, 04 then enter the appropriate scale score in Coping Effectiveness -Task Achievement.

   (b) If to Q26 the code is anything except 07, then again enter the appropriate scale score for Coping Effectiveness-Task Achievement.

   (c) Add the scale scores for Q23 and Q26 and divide by two. This is the final Task Achievement Coping Effectiveness scale score for that child.

   (d) If the code for Q23 is not 01, 02, 03, Or 04, then the scale score of the code given to Q26 is the final Task Ashievement Coping Effectiveness scale score for that child.

   (e) The same logic should be followed for all other dimensions.

SCALING MANUAL FOR PARENT-INTERVIEW DATA

I. Child-Relevant Items

cl
Col. 62-63 Q23: Words or phrases describing x in terms of schoolwork

(a) Area: Academic Task Achievement-Coping Effectiveness

Scale Score 5: Code 01
Scale Score 3: Codes 02,03
Scale Score 1: Code 04

(b) Area: Task Achievement-Affect

Scale Score 3: Code 05
Scale Score 2: Code 06
Scale Score 1: Code 07

(c) Area: Interpersonal Relations-Affect

Scale Score 3: Code 08
Scale Score 1: Code 09

cl Q24: How does x feel about school?
Col. 64-65

(a) Area: Attitude Toward Task Achievement

Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,04,07
Scale Score 1: Codes 05,06

cl Q25: Omit
Col. 66-67

cl Q26A: How do you think he does in school?
Col. 68-69

(a) Area: Academic Task Achievement-Coping Effectiveness

Scale Score 5: Code 01
Scale Score 4: Code 02
Scale Score 3: Codes 03,04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

Note: Use Q23 a and b only if Q24 a and Q26 a are invalid.

c2
Col. 11-12

Q29: When x has homework, what does he usually do?

(a) Area: Academic Task Achievement-Engagement

Scale Score 3: Codes 02,03,04,05
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,06
Scale Score 1: Code 07

c2
Col. 13-14

Q30: How does he go about it?

(a) Area: Academic Task Achievement-Initiator

Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,06,07,08,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,05

c2
Col. 17-18

Q32: How often does he put off his homework to do other things?

(a) Area: Academic Task Achievement-Engagement

Scale Score 3: Codes 41,42,43,51
Scale Score 2: Codes 31,32,33,34,35,36
Scale Score 1: Codes 11,21,22,23

c2
Col. 19-20

Q33: What if the child was nearly finished with his homework and he found he was doing it the wrong way?

Scale a (affect): Omit

Scale b: Area: Academic Task Achievement-Persistence
Scale Score 3: Codes 11,21,22,31,32
Scale Score 2: Codes 41,51,61,81
Scale Score 1: Code 71

c2
Col. 33-34

Q38: How far do you think he really will go (in school)?

(a) Area: Child's level of academic attainment as estimated by parent. (Related to demographic item)

Scale Score 7: Code 01
Scale Score 6: Code 02
Scale Score 5: Code 03
Scale Score 4: Codes 07,08
Scale Score 3: Code 04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c2 Q39: What kind of things does x do?
Col. 35-36

(a) Area: Activity Level
Scale Score 1: Codes 00
Scale Score 2: Code 01
Scale Score 3: Code 02
Scale Score 4: Code 03
Scale Score 5: Code 04
Scale Score 6: Code 05
Scale Score 7: Code 06
Scale Score 8: Code 07
Scale Score 9: Codes 08,09,10,11,etc.

Q40A: What kind of things does he do with you?

(a) Area: Parent-Child Interaction (Mother)
c2 Part 1 (First Response)
Col. 37-38 Scale Score 3: Code 03
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,04.06
Scale Score 1: Code 05

c2 Part 2 (Second Response)
Col. 39-40 Scale Score 3: Code 03
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,04,06
Scale Score 1: Code 05

(Add these two scaled scores and divide by two for the final scale score. If only one scale score is valid, do not divide by two.)

c2 Q40B: Omit
Col. 41-46

c2 Q40C: Total number of mother-child activities
Col. 47-48

(a) Area: Activity Level Parent-Child Interaction
Scale Score 1: Codes 00
Scale Score 2: Code 01
Scale Score 3: Code 02
Scale Score 4: Code 03
Scale Score 5: Code 04
Scale Score 6: Code 05
Scale Score 7: Code 06
Scale Score 8: Code 07
Scale Score 9: Codes 08,09,10, etc.

c2 Q41A: What kind of things does he do with his father?
Col. 49-50

(a) Area: Parent-Child Interaction (Father)
Part 1 (First Response)
Scale Score 3: Code 03
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,04,07
Scale Score 1: Code 05,06

c2
Col. 51-52

Part 2 (Second Response)
Scale Score 3: Code 03
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,04,07
Scale Score 1: Codes 05,06

(Add these two scaled scores and divide by two for the final scale score. If only one scale score is valid, do not divide by two.)

c2
Col. 53-56

Q41B: Omit

c2
Col. 57-58

Q41C: Total number of father-child activities

Area: Activity Level. Parent-Child Interaction
Scale Score 1: Codes 00
Scale Score 2: Code 01
Scale Score 3: Code 02
Scale Score 4: Code 03
Scale Score 5: Code 04
Scale Score 6: Code 05
Scale Score 7: Code 06
Scale Score 8: Code 07
Scale Score 9: Codes 08,09,10, etc.

c2
Col. 59-60

Q42: Omit

c2
Col. 61-64

Q43: Does he belong to any clubs, organizations, etc?

Area: Activity Level. Non-Academic Task Achievement

	Col. 61-62		Col. 63-64
Scale Score 3:	01,02,03,04,05, 06,07	&	01,02,03,04,05, 06,07,89
Scale Score 2:	01,02,03,04,05, 06,07	&	08
OR	08	&	01,02,03,04,05, 06,07
Scale Score 1:	08	&	08

c2
Col. 65-68

Q44: Does he have any hobbies, lessons, or classes?

Area: Activity Level. Non-Academic Task Achievement

	Col. 65-66		Col. 67-68
Scale Score 3:	01,02,03,04,05	&	01,02,03,04,05,89
Scale Score 2:	01,02,03,04,05	&	06
OR	06	&	01,02,03,04,05
Scale Score 1:	06	&	06

c2
Col. 71-72

Q46: How does he respond to this? (See Q45 of PRI)

Area: Authority. Engagement & Coping Effectiveness

c2
Col. 71-72

(1) Engagement
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,04,05
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,03
Scale Score 1: Codes 06,07

c2
Col. 71-72

(2) Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Code 01
Scale Score 4: Codes 02,04,05
Scale Score 3: Code 03
Scale Score 2: Code 06
Scale Score 1: Code 07

c3
Col. 11-12

Q49: Omit

c3
Col. 13-16

Q50A Jobs or chores. Demographic code, score first two responses.

Area: Number of household chores mentioned

	Col. 13-14		Col. 15-16
Scale Score 3:	01,02,03,04,05,06, 07,08,09,10,11,12	&	01,02,03,04,05 06,07,08,09,10, 11,12
Scale Score 2:	01,02,03,04,05,06, 07,08,09,10,11,12,	&	13,14,15,
Scale Score 1:	13,14,15 [illegible]	&	13,14,15

c3
Col. 17-18

Q50B: Omit

c3
Col. 21-22

Q52: How often do you have to see that he does them?

Area: Non-Academic Task Achievement. Initiator

Scale Score 3: Codes 04,05
Scale Score 2: Code 03
Scale Score 1: Codes 01,02

c3
Col. 23-34

Q53: Does he try to get others to do them for him?

Area: Non-Academic Task Achievement. Implementation

Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,05,06

c3
Col. 25-26

Q54: How well does he do them?

Area: Non-Academic Task Achievement. Coping Effectiveness

Scale Score 5: Code 01
Scale Score 4: Code 02
Scale Score 3: Code 03
Scale Score 2: Code 04
Scale Score 1: Code 05

c3
Col. 27-28

Q55: How often does x help around the house without being asked?

Area: Non-Academic Task Achievement. Initiator

Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02
Scale Score 2: Code 03
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,05

c3
Col. 29-30

Q56: (Never been scaled)

c3
Col. 31-34

Q57: What does he do? (In response to punishment mentioned in Q56)

Area: Authority, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness

Scale A. Affect
1st response
    Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,10
    Scale Score 2: Codes 03,05,11
    Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06,07,08,09

2nd response:
    Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,10 (and 89 if 01, 02,10 in 1st response above)
    Scale Score 2: Codes 03,05,11 (and 89 if 03, 05,11 in 1st response above)
    Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06,07,08,09 (and 89 if 04,06,07,08,09 in 1st response above)

Summate the two scaled scores for Affect and divide by 2 for the final scale score for this item. If only one scale score is valid do not divide by 2.
Scale B: Coping Effectiveness
1st response:
    Scale Score 5: Codes 01,10
    Scale Score 4: Code 02

Scale Score 3: Codes 03,05,11
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,06.07
Scale Score 1: Codes 08,09

2nd response:
Scale Score 5: Codes 01,10 (or 89 if 01,10 in 1st response)
Scale Score 4: Code 02 (or 89 if 02 in 1st response)
Scale Score 3: Codes 03,05,11 (or 89 if 03, 05,11 in 1st response)
Scale Score 2: Codes 06,07 (or 89 if 04,06, 07 in 1st response), 04
Scale Score 1: 08,09 (or 89 if 08,09 in 1st response)

Summate these two scaled scores for Coping Effectiveness and divide by 2 for the final scale score for this item. Do not divide by 2 if only one scale score is valid.

c3
Col. 35-36

Q58 (Never been scaled)

Q59: What does x do? (In response to punishment mentioned in Q58)

Area: Authority, Affect and Coping Effectiveness

Scale A: Affect

c3
Col. 37-38

1st response:
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,10
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,05,11
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06,07,08.09

c3
Col. 39-40

2nd response:
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,10 (or 89 if 01, 02,10 in 1st response)
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,05,11 (or 89 if 03, 05,11 in 1st response)
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06,07,08,09 (or 89 if 04,06,07,08,09 in 1st response)

Summate these two scaled scores for Affect and divide by two for final Affect scale score for this item. Do not divide by two if only one scale score is valid.

Scale B: Coping Effectiveness

c3
Col. 37-38

1st response:
Scale Score 5: Codes 01,10
Scale Score 4: Codes 02
Scale Score 3: Codes 03,05,11
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,06,07
Scale Score 1: Codes 08,09

c3
Col. 39-40

2nd response:
Scale Score 5: Codes 01,10 (or 89 if 01,10 in 1st response)
Scale Score 4: Code 02 (or 89 if 02 in 1st response)
Scale Score 3: Codes 03,05,11 (or 89 if 03, 05,11 in 1st response)
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,06.07 (or 89 if 04, 06,07 in 1st response)
Scale Score 1: Codes 08,09 (or 89 if 08.09 in 1st response)

Summate these two scaled scores for Coping Effectiveness and divide by 2 for the final Coping Effectiveness scale score for this item. Do not divide by 2 if only one scale score is valid.

Q60: How does he react when you criticize him?

Area: Authority. Affect and Coping Effectiveness

c3
Col. 41-42

Scale A: Affect
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,11
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,06,09,13
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,05,07,08,10,12

c3
Col. 41-42

Scale B: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Codes 01,11
Scale Score 4: Code 02
Scale Score 3: Codes 03,06,09,13
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,05,07,08,12
Scale Score 1: Code 10

Q61: How does he react when his father/mother criticizes him?

Area: Authority. Affect and Coping Effectiveness

c3
Col. 43-44

Scale A: Affect
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,11
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,06,09,13
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,05,07,08,10,12

c3
Col. 43-44

Scale B: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Codes 01,11
Scale Score 4: Codes 02
Scale Score 3: Codes 03,06,09,13
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,05,07,08,12
Scale Score 1: Code 10

Q62: How does he react when his brothers, sisters, or other children criticize him?

Area: Interpersonal Relations, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness

c3
Col. 45-46

Scale A: Affect
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,06
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,05
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04

c3
Col. 45-46

Scale B: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Code 01
Scale Score 4: Codes 02,06
Scale Score 3: Code 05
Scale Score 2: Code 03
Scale Score 1: Code 04

c3
Col. 47-48

Q63: Does x have a regualr job or work outside the home?

Area: Whether or not child has a job (Dochotomy)

Scale Score 3: Codes 02,03,04,05,06,07,08
Scale Score 1: Code 01

c3
Col. 49-50

Q64: Omit

c3
Col. 51-52

Q65: Omit

c3
Col. 53-54

Q66: Omit

c3
Col. 55-56

Q67: Omit

c3
Col. 57-58

Q68: Omit

c3
Col. 67-68

Q73A: How does x get along with other children? Parents' evaluation

Area: Interpersonal Relations. Coping Effectiveness

Scale Score 5: Code 01
Scale Score 4: No codes
Scale Score 3: Code 02

Scale Score 2: No codes
Scale Score 1: Code 03

c3
Col. 69-70
Q73B: Omit

Q75: In what way do x's friends influence his behavior?

c3
Col. 73-74
75a: Omit

c3
Col. 73-74
75b: Area: Type of peer influence on child's behavior
(From positive to negative)

Scale Score 3: Code 02
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,03,05,06
Scale Score 1: Code 04

c3
Col. 75-76
Q76: Omit

Q77: When x gets worried, what does he do about it?

Area: Anxiety, Stance, Engagement, Affect, Coping Effectiveness

c4
Col. 11-12
(1) Stance
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,03,04,11
Scale Score 2: Codes 07,13
Scale Score 1: Codes 02,05,06,08,09,10,12

c4
Col. 11-12
(2) Engagement
Scale Score 3: Code 01
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,04,07
Scale Score 1: Codes 02,05,06,08,09,10, 11,12,13

c4
Col. 11-12
(3) Affect
Scale Score 3: No codes
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,03,04,06,07,09, 11,12,13
Scale Score 1: Codes 02,05,08,10

c4
Col. 11-12
(4) Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Codes 01,03
Scale Score 4: Codes 04,11,13
Scale Score 3: Codes 06,07,09,12
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,08,10
Scale Score 1: Code 05

c4
Col. 13-14
Q78: Omit

c4
Col. 15-16
Q79: Omit

Q80: When he has worries, does he turn to others for help?

Area: Anxiety, Aid or Advice Requested

c4
Col. 17-18
1st response:
Scale Score 3: Code 01
Scale Score 2: No codes
Scale Score 1: Codes 02,03,04,05,06,07,08, 09,10

c4
Col. 19-20
2nd response:
Scale Score 3: Code 01 (or 89 if 01 in 1st response)
Scale Score 2: No codes
Scale Score 1: Code 02 through 10 (or 89 if 02 through 10 in 1st response)

Summate these two scaled scores and divide by 2 to obtain final scale score for this item. Do not divide by 2 if only one scale score is valid.

c4
Col. 23-24
Q82: Omit

c4
Col. 25-26
Q83: Omit

c4
Col. 27-28
Q84: What does x usually do when he gets angry?

Area: Aggression, Engagement, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness
(Scaling for Stance has been omitted)

c4
Col. 27-28
Scale 1: Engagement
Scale Score 3: Codes 09,10
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,03,04,05,07,08
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c4
Col. 27-28
Scale 2: Affect
Scale Score 3: No codes
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,03,08,09,10
Scale Score 1: Codes 02,04,05,06,07

c4
Col. 27-28

Scale 3: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Codes 09,10
Scale Score 4: Codes 01,03
Scale Score 3: Code 08
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,05,07
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06

c4
Col. 29-30

Q85: What does x usually do when he gets angry at you?

Area: Aggression, Engagement, Affect, & Coping Effectiveness

(Scaling for Stance has been omitted)

c4
Col. 29-30

Scale 1: Engagement
Scale Score 3: No codes
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,06,07,08,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,05,10,11

c4
Col. 29-30

Scale 2: Affect
Scale Score 3: No codes
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,05,07,09,10,11
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,06,08

c4
Col. 29-30

Scale 3: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Code 07
Scale Score 4: Codes 02,09
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,05,11
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,04,10
Scale Score 1: Codes 06,08

c4
Col. 31-32

Q86: What does x usually do when he gets angry at his father/mother?

Area: Aggression, Engagement, Affect, & Coping Effectiveness
(Scaling for Stance has been omitted)

c4
Col. 31-32

Scale 1: Engagement
Scale Score 3: No codes
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,06,07,08,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,05,10,11

c4
Col. 31-32

Scale 2: Affect
Scale Score 3: No codes
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,05,07,09,10,11
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,06,08

c4
Col. 31-32

Scale 3: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Code 07
Scale Score 4: Codes 02,09
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,05,11
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,04,10
Scale Score 1: Codes 06,08

c4
Col. 33-34

Q87: What does x usually do when a friend is angry at him?

Area: Aggression, Engagement, Affect, Coping Effectiveness

(The scaling for Stance has been omitted)

c4
Col. 33-34

Scale 1: Engagement
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,07
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,03,04,05,06,10
Scale Score 1: Code 08

c4
Col. 33-34

Scale 2: Affect
Scale Score 3: No codes
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,04,06,08,10
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,05,07

c4
Col. 33-34

Scale 3: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Code 01
Scale Score 4: Code 06
Scale Score 3: Codes 02,04,08,10
Scale Score 2: Codes 03,05
Scale Score 1: Code 07

c4

Q88: What does x usually do when someone hurts his feelings?

Area: Interpersonal Relations, Stance, Engagement, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness

c4
Col. 35-36

Scale 1: Stance
Scale Score 3: Codes 04,05,06.07,09,10
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,03,08,11
Scale Score 1: No codes

c4
Col. 35-36

Scale 2: Engagement
Scale Score 3: Codes 09,10
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,03,05,08,11
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06.07

c4
Col. 35-36

Scale 3: Affect
  Scale Score 3: No codes
  Scale Score 2: Codes 01,04,06,09,10,11
  Scale Score 1: Codes 02,03,05,07,08

c4
Col. 35-36

Scale 4: Coping Effectiveness
  Scale Score 5: Codes 06,09
  Scale Score 4: Codes 01,04,10
  Scale Score 3: Code 11
  Scale Score 2: Codes 02,03,05,08
  Scale Score 1: Code 07

II. Parent-Relevant Items

c1
Col. 68-69

Q26B: Parents' satisfaction with child's school performance

Area: Parents' evaluation of child's academic task achievement

Scale Score 3: Code 02
Scale Score 2: Code 01
Scale Score 1: Code 03

c1
Col. 71-72

Q27: Do you do anything to encourage x in his schoolwork?

Area: Child's academic task achievement. Parental implementation

Scale Score 3: Codes 03,04,05,06,08
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,07,09
Scale Score 1: Code 01

c1
Col. 73-74

Q28: Have you met x's teacher? Yes, No. How did you meet?

Area: Child's academic task achievement. Parental initiation

Scale Score 3: Codes 06.07
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,05
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04
Scale Score 0: Code 01

c2
Col. 15-16

Q31: What do you do to see that x gets his homework done?

Area: Child's academic task achievement. Degree of active and direct intervention by parent in child's homework

Scale Score 3: Codes 32,51
Scale Score 2: Codes 21,22,23,31,33,41
Scale Score 1: Codes 11,12,13,14,15,16

c2
Col. 21-22

Q34: What do you feel the school's job or responsibility is?

Area: Parents' conception of the major function of school - Task Achievement or other (Dichotomy)

Scale Score 1: Codes 01,02,03,06,07,10
Scale Score 0: Codes 04,05,08,09,11

c2
Col. 27-28

Q35: How important do you think school is?

Area: Child's Task Achievement. Parental attitude toward the impprtance of school

Scale Score 4: Code 01
Scale Score 3: Code 02
Scale Score 2: Code 03
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,05

c2
Col. 29-30

Q36: Why? (Is school important - see Q35)

Area: Parents' conception of the major function of school - Task Achievement or other (Dichotomy)

Scale Score 1: Codes 01,02
Scale Score 0: Codes 03,04,05

c2
Col. 31-32

Q37: How far would you like your child to go in school?

Area: Parental aspiration for child's level of academic attainment

Scale Score 7: Code 01
Scale Score 6: Code 02
Scale Score 5: Code 03
Scale Score 4: Codes 07,08
Scale Score 3: Code 04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c2
Col. 69-70

Q45: When you want x to do something, how do you go about getting him to do it?

Area: Child's Non-Academic Task Achievement.
Strength of parental directiveness

Scale Score 6: Code 06
Scale Score 5: Code 05
Scale Score 4: Code 04
Scale Score 3: Code 03
Scale Score 2: Code 02
Scale Score 1: Code 01

c2
Col. 73-74 Q47: What follow-up is needed to see that he does it?

(See Q45 and 46)

Area: Degree of Implementation by parent for child's non-academic Task Achievement (Dichotomy)

Scale Score 3: Codes 03,04,05,06,07,08
Scale Score 1: Codes 01,02

c2
Col. 75-76 Q48: If you see that he isn't doing a job right, what do you do?

Area: Degree of constructive guidance by parents

Scale Score 5: Code 02
Scale Score 4: Code 03
Scale Score 3: Code 01
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c3
Col. 19-20 Q51: What are the reasons for his having them? (jobs around the house)

Area: Child's growth versus parental convenience

Scale Score 3: Codes 03,04,06
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Codes 01,02,07

c3
Col. 59-60 Q69: What particular type of job or occupation would you like to see x take up when he is grown?

Area: Socio-economic status level of the parents' aspiration for the child

Scale Score 7: Code 01
Scale Score 6: Code 02
Scale Score 5: Code 03

Scale Score 4: Codes 08,09,10,11,12
Scale Score 3: Code 04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c3
Col. 61-62
Q70: Omit

c3
Col. 63-64
Q71: What type of work do you feel that x would like to do when he grows up?

Area: Socio-economic status level of parents' estimate of child's aspiration

Scale Score 7: Code 01
Scale Score 6: Code 02
Scale Score 5: Code 03
Scale Score 4: Codes 08,09
Scale Score 3: Code 04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c3
Col. 65-66
Q72: What type of work do you feel that x probably will do when he grows up?

Area: Socio-economic status level of parents' expectation for the child

Scale Score 7: Code 01
Scale Score 6: Code 02
Scale Score 5: Code 03
Scale Score 4: Codes 08,09
Scale Score 3: Code 04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c3
Col. 71-72
Q74: What do you do to help x get along with other children?

Area: Degree of constructive guidance for interpersonal relations

Scale Score 3: Codes 02,03
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,05,06
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,07

c4
Col. 21-22
Q81: What do you usually advise x to do when he is worried?

Area: Parents' degree of encouragement of the child to deal actively with his anxiety

Scale Score 4: Codes 08,09,10,11,12
Scale Score 3: Code 04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c3
Col. 61-62
Q70: Omit

c3
Col. 63-64
Q71: What type of work do you feel that x would like to do when he grows up?

Area: Socio-economic status level of parents' estimate of child's aspiration

Scale Score 7: Code 01
Scale Score 6: Code 02
Scale Score 5: Code 03
Scale Score 4: Codes 08,09
Scale Score 3: Code 04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c3
Col. 65-66
Q72: What type of work do you feel that x probably will do when he grows up?

Area: Socio-economic status level of parents' expectation for the child

Scale Score 7: Code 01
Scale Score 6: Code 02
Scale Score 5: Code 03
Scale Score 4: Codes 08,09
Scale Score 3: Code 04
Scale Score 2: Code 05
Scale Score 1: Code 06

c3
Col. 71-72
Q74: What do you do to help x get along with other children?

Area: Degree of constructive guidance for interpersonal relations

Scale Score 3: Codes 02,03
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,05,06
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,07

c4
Col. 21-22
Q81: What do you usually advise x to do when he is worried?

Area: Parents' degree of encouragement of the child to deal actively with his anxiety

Scale Score 3: Code 02
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,03,04,05,06
Scale Score 1: Code 07

c4
Col. 37-40
Q89: Omit

c4
Col. 41-44
Q90: Omit. (Due to the wide variation in the ages of the parents, the opportunity for such training varies.)

c4
Col. 45-46
Q91: Omit

c4
Col. 47-48
Q92: Omit as refers to Q90

c4
Col. 49-50
Q93: Omit

c4
Col. 51-52
Q94: Omit

c4
Col. 53-54
Q95: You said you were a_______. Could tell me how you came to be in this kind of work?

Area: "Locus of Control" (Note: This item is not to be scaled for mothers, only for fathers.)

Scale Score 3: Code 01
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,05,07,08
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,06

c4
Col. 55-56
Q96: Omit

c4
Col. 57-58
Q97: How do you feel about it? (your job)

Area: "Parental Attitude Toward Job"

Scale Score 3: Code 01
Scale Score 2: Code 02
Scale Score 1: Code 03

c4
Col. 59-60
Q98: Not to be scaled. Will be treated like the childrens' Occupational Values data.

c4
Col. 61-62
Q99: Not to be scaled. Same as Q98

c4
Col. 63-64

Q100: Would you choose the same kind of work if you had it to do over?

Area: Degree of Job Satisfaction

Scale Score 3: Code 02
Scale Score 2: Code 03
Scale Score 1: Code 01

c4
Col. 65-66

Q101: When you are on the job and problems come up about the work, what do you do?

Area: Task Achievement - Implementation

Scale Score 3: Code 01
Scale Score 2: Codes 02,03
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,05,06
Scale Score 0: Codes 07,08,09

c4
Col. 67-68

Q102: What is the best way to get along with your fellow workers (colleagues)?

Area: Degree of Interpersonal Orientation

Scale Score 3: Codes 04,05
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02
Scale Score 1: Code 03

c4
Col. 69-70

Q103: What is the best way to get along with your boss or supervisor?

Area: Task Achievement Orientation (in authority relationship) A dichotomy

Scale Score 2: Codes 02,03
Scale Score 1: Codes 01,04,05,06

c4
Col. 71-72

Q104: What do you think or do when criticized?

Area: Interpersonal Relations, Stance, Engagement, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness

c4
Col. 71-72

Scale 1: Stance
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,06,07,11
Scale Score 2: Code 09
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,05,08,10

c4
Col. 71-72

Scale 2: Engagement
Scale Score 3: Codes 06.07
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 02,03,04,05,08,10,11

c4
Col. 71-72

Scale 3: Affect
Scale Score 3: Code 05
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,03,07,09

c4
Col. 71-72

Scale 4: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Code 07
Scale Score 4: Code 02
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,03,05,09
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,08,10
Scale Score 1: Codes 06,11

c4
Col. 73-74

Q105: By husband/wife (What do you think or do when criticized?)

Area: Interpersonal Relations, Stance, Engagement, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness

c4
Col. 73-74

Scale 1: Stance
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,06,07,11
Scale Score 2: Code 09
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,05,08,10

c4
Col. 73-74

Scale 2: Engagement
Scale Score 3: Codes 06.07
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 02,03,04,05,08,10,11

c4
Col. 73-74

Scale 3: Affect
Scale Score 3: Code 05
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,03,07,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06,08,10,11

c4
Col. 73-74

Scale 4: Coping Effectiveness
Scale Score 5: Code 07
Scale Score 4: Code 02
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,03,05,09
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,08,10
Scale Score 1: Codes 06,11

c4
Col. 75-76

Q106: By friends? (What do you think or do when criticized?)

Area: Interpersonal Relations, Stance, Engagement, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness

c4
Col. 75-76

Scale 1: Stance
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,06,07,11
Scale Score 2: Code 09
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,05,08,10

c4 Scale 2: Engagement
Col. 75-76 Scale Score 3: Codes 06,07
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,09
Scale Score 1: Codes o2,03,04,05,08,10,11

c4 Scale 3: Affect
Col. 75-76 Scale Score 3: Code 05
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,03,07,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06,08,10,11

c4 Scale 4: Coping Effectiveness
Col. 75-76 Scale Score 5: Code 07
Scale Score 4: Code 02
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,03,05,09
Scale Score 2: Codes 04,08,10
Scale Score 1: Codes 06,11

c5 Q107: By your own children? (What do you think or
Col. 11-12 do when criticized?)

Area: Interpersonal Relations, Stance, Engagement, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness

c5 Scale 1: Stance
Col. 11-12 Scale Score 3: Codes 01,02,06,07,10
Scale Score 2: Code 09
Scale Score 1: Codes 03,04,05,08

c5 Scale 2: Engagement
Col. 11-12 Scale Score 3: Codes 06,07,10
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 02,03,04,05,08

c5 Scale 3: Affect
Col. 11-12 Scale Score 3: Code 05
Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,03,07,09
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06,08,10

C5 Scale 4: Coping Effectiveness
Col. 11-12 Scale Score 5: Code 07
Scale Score 4: Codes 02,05
Scale Score 3: Codes 01,03,09
Scale Score 2: No codes
Scale Score 1: Codes 04,06,08,10

(Note to Japan regarding Q104 through Q107: We shall not change the scaling of overt hostile behavior (Scale Score 1) since it is essential that the interview data be scaled in a manner consistent with the scaling of Stage i data. Overt hostile behavior has been assigned a scale score of 1 on the dimension of Coping Effectiveness for all Stage I Sentence Completion stems which are similar to the above-mentioned items.)

c5 Col. 13-14 Q108: Omit

c5 Col. 15-16 Q109: What do you usually do when you are angry?

Area: Aggression, Stance, Engagement, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness

c5 Col. 15-16 Scale 1: Stance
- Scale Score 3: Codes 03,06,09
- Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,04,05,07,08
- Scale Score 1: No codes

c5 Col. 15-16 Scale 2: Engagement
- Scale Score 3: Code 09
- Scale Score 2: Codes 01,02,03,04,05,07,08
- Scale Score 1: Code 06

c5 Col. 15-16 Scale 3: Affect
- Scale Score 3: No codes
- Scale Score 2: Codes 01,03,08,09
- Scale Score 1: Codes 02,04,05,06,07

c5 Col. 15-16 Scale 4: Coping Effectiveness
- Scale Score 5: Code 09
- Scale Score 4: Codes 01,03
- Scale Score 3: Code 08
- Scale Score 2: Codes 02,05,07
- Scale Score 1: Codes 04, 06

c5 Col. 17-46 Q110: Not scaled. Enter tank order of occupational values.

Instructions for Obtaining Final Scales Scores From Parent Interview

I. Child-Relevant Information

A. Academic Task Achievement

1. Stance: No data
2. Engagement: Sum scaled scores of Q29 and Q32 and divide by 2.
3. Initiation: Enter Q30 scaled score
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementaor: No data
6. Affect: Enter Q23 (Scale b) scaled score
7. Coping Effectiveness: Sum scaled scores of Q23 (Scale a) and Q26A. Divide this by 2.
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous:
   Q33b: Label as Persistence
   Q38: Label as Fstimate of Level of Attainment

10. Attitude Toward: Enter scaled score of Q24

B. Non-Academic Task Achievement

1. Stance: No data
2. Engagement: No data
3. Initiation: Sum scaled scores of Q52 and 55; then divide by 2.
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementation: Enter scaled score for Q53
6. Affect: No data
7. Coping Effectiveness: Enter scaled score for Q54
8. Level of Activity: Sum scaled scores for Q39,Q43, and Q44 and divide by 3.
9. Miscellaneous: No data
10. Attitude Toward: No data

C. Authority

1. Stance: No data
2. Engagement: Enter scaled score of Q46
3. Initiation: No data
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementation: No data
6. Affect: Sum the scale scores of Q57 (Scale a), Q59 (Scale a), Q60 (Scale a), and Q61 (Scale a). Divide by 4.

7. Coping Effectiveness: Sum the scale scores of Q46 (Scale 2), Q57 (Scale B), Q59 (Scale B), Q60 (Scale B), and Q61 (Scale B). Divide this total by 5.
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous: No data
10. Attitude Toward: No data

D. Interpersonal Relations

1. Stance: Enter scale score of Q88 (Scale 1)
2. Engagement: Enter scale score of Q88 (Scale 2)
3. Initiation: No data
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementor: No data
6. Affect: Sum the scale scores of Q23 (Scale c), Q62 (Scale a), and Q88 (Scale 3). Then divide this total by 3.
7. Coping Effectiveness: Sum the scale scores of Q62 (Scale B), Q73A, and Q88 (Scale 4). Divide this total by 3.
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous: Label Q25B as Type of Peer Influence on Child's Behavior.
10. Attitude Toward: No data

E. Anxiety

1. Stance: Enter scale score for Q77 (Scale 1).
2. Engagement: Enter scale score for Q77 (Scale 2).
3. Initiation: No data
4. Aid/Advice: Enter final scale score for Q80.
5. Implementation: No data
6. Affect: Enter scale score for Q77 (Scale 3).
7. Coping Effectiveness: Enter scale score for Q77 (Scale 4).
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous: No data
10. Attitude Toward: No data

F. Aggression

1. Stance: No data
2. Engagement: Sum the scale scores for Q84 (Scale 1), Q85 (Scale 1), Q86 (Scale 1), and Q87 (Scale 1). Then divide this total by 4.
3. Initiator: No data
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementor: No data

6. Affect: Sum the scale scores for Q84 (Scale 2), Q85 (Scale 2), Q86 (Scale 2), and Q87 (Scale 2). Then divide this total by 4.
7. Coping Effectiveness: Sum the scale scores for Q84 (Scale 3), Q85 (Scale 3), Q86 (Scale 3), and Q87 (Scale 3). Then divide this total by 4.
8. Level of activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous: No data
10. Attitude Toward: No data

G. Miscellaneous:
Q50A: Label as Number of Household Chores Mentioned
Q63: Lavel as Does child have a job?

H. Parent-Child Interaction

1. Activity Level: Sum the scale scores of Q40C and Q41C, then divide by 2.
2. Miscellaneous: Sum the scale scores of Q40A and Q41A, then divide by 2.

II. Parent-Relevant Information

A. Academic Task Achievement

1. Stance: No data
2. Engagement: No data
3. Initiation: Enter scale score for Q28
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementation: Enter scale score for Q27
6. Affect: No data
7. Coping Effectiveness: No data
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous:
   Q26B. Label as Parents' Evaluation of Child's Academic Task Achievement
   Q31. Label as Degree of Active Intervention by Parent in Child's Homework
   Q37. Label as Parental Aspiration For Child's Level of Academic Attainment
10. Attitude Toward: Sum the scale scores for Q34, Q35, and Q36 and divide this total by 3.

B. Non-Academic Task Achievement

1. Stance: No data
2. Engagement: No data
3. Initiation: No data
4. Aid/Advice: No data

5. Implementation: Sum the scale scores for Q47 and Q101 and divide this total by 2.
6. Affect: No data
7. Coping Effectiveness: No data
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous:
   Q45: Label as Strength of Parental Directiveness
   Q48: Label as Degree of Constructive Guidance by Parents
   Q51: Label as Child's Growth vs Parental Convenience
   Q69: Label as Socio-economic Status Level of Parents' Aspiration for the Child
   Q71: Label as Socio-economic Status Level of Parents' Estimate of Child's Aspiration
   Q72: Label as Socio-economic Status of Parents' Expectation for the Child
10. Attitude Toward: Sum the scale scores of Q97 and Q100 and divide this total by 2.

C. Authority

1. Stance: No data
2. Engagement: No data
3. Initiation: No data
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementation: No data
6. Affect: No data
7. Coping Effectiveness: No data
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous:
   Q103: Label as Task Achievement Orientation in Authority Relationship
10. Attitude Toward: No data

D. Interpersonal Relations

1. Stance: Sum together the scale scores for Q104 (Scale 1), Q105 (Scale 1), Q106 (Scale 1), and Q107 (Scale 1). Then divide this total by 4.
2. Engagement: Sum together the scale scores for Q104 (Scale 2), Q105 (Scale 2), Q106 (Scale 2) and Q107 (Scale 2). Then divide this total by 4.
3. Initiation: No data
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementation: No data
6. Affect: Sum together the scale scores for Q104 (Scale 3), Q105 (Scale 3), Q106 (Scale 3), and Q107 (Scale 3). Then divide this total by 4.

7. Coping Effectiveness: Sum together the scale scores for Q104 (Scale 4), Q105 (Scale 4), Q106 (Scale 4), and Q107 (Scale 4). Then divide this total by 4.
8. Level of activity: no data
9. Miscellaneous:
   - Q74: Label as Degree of Constructive Guidance For Interpersonal Relations
   - Q102: Label as Degree of Interpersonal Orientation
10. Attitude Toward: No data

E. Anxiety

1. Stance: No data
2. Engagement: No data
3. Initiator: No data
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementation: No data
6. Affect: No data
7. Coping Effectiveness: No data
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous: No data
10. Attitude Toward: No data

F. Aggression

1. Stance: Enter scale score for Q109 (Scale 1)
2. Engagement: Enter scale score for Q109 (Scale 2)
3. Initiation: No data
4. Aid/Advice: No data
5. Implementation: No data
6. Affect: Enter scale score for Q109 (Scale 3)
7. Coping Effectiveness: Enter scale score for Q109 (Scale 4)
8. Level of Activity: No data
9. Miscellaneous: No data
10. Attitude Toward: No data

G. Miscellaneous

Q95: Label as Locus of Control

H. Parent-Child Interaction

No data

PARENT INTERVIEW

Classification of Child-Relevant Items as to (a) Area of Concern and (b) Type of Scaling Imposed

	TA Acad	TA Non-Acad	Auth	IPR	Anx.	Agg.	Other Misc.or Unique	P-C Inter-Action
Stance				Q88	Q77			
Engagement	Q29 Q32		Q46	Q88	Q77	Q84,Q85, Q86,Q87		
Initiation	Q30	Q52, Q55						
Aid/Advice					Q80			
Implementor		Q53						
Affect	Q23		Q57,Q59, Q60,Q61	Q23, Q62, Q88	Q77	Q84,Q85, Q86,Q87		
Coping Effective-ness	Q23, Q26A	Q54	Q46,Q57, Q59,Q60, Q61	Q62, Q73A Q88	Q77	Q84,Q85, Q86,Q87		
Level of Activity		Q39, Q43, Q44						Q40C, Q41C
Misc. & Unique	Q33b, Q38			Q75b			Q50A, Q63	Q40A, Q41A
Attitude Toward	Q24							

PARENT INTERVIEW

Classification of Parent-Relevant Items as to
(a) Area of Concern and (b) Type of Scaling Imposed

	TA Acad	TA Non-Acad	Auth	IPR	Anx	Agg	Other Misc.or Unique	P-C Inter-action
Stance				Q104 Q105 Q106 Q107		Q109		
Engagement --				Q104 Q105 Q106 Q107		Q109		
Initiation	Q28							
Aid/Advice								
Implementor	Q27	Q47,Q101						
Affect				Q104 Q105 Q106 Q107		Q109		
Coping Effective-ness				Q104 Q105 Q106 Q107		Q109		
Level of Activity								
Misc. & Unique	Q26B, Q31, Q37	Q71,Q72 Q45,Q48, Q51,Q69	Q103	Q74 Q102	Q81		Q95	
Attitude Toward	Q34, Q35, Q36	Q97, Q100						

Conclusion

In general, the interview appears to have been successful in collecting parent perceptions, within the usual limitations of self-report measurement. The method was feasible in that all stations were able to complete their interviews within the prescriptions of the sample, the content of the interview material was related to the data collected from children in Stage I, and the coding was of sufficiently high comparability across stations to permit meaningful comparisons.

On the negative side, the process was so time consuming that the sample of parents was necessarily limited. This, in turn, limited the fineness of analysis by research design variables as the cell frequencies became too small when the sample was broken down by many dimensions. In view of the paucity of these kinds of data in cross-cultural studies, however, the effort seemed worthwhile.

SECTION II

PROCEDURE: INTRACOUNTRY REPORTS

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT:
A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The University of Texas at Austin

1974

PROCEDURE: INTRACOUNTRY REPORTS

BRAZIL

Procedure

The data collecting concerning the interviews with parents was carried out in 1967.

The sample of parents was chosen as follows: 1. Each subject of the eight groups was classified as an over- or under-achiever, taking into consideration the group Achievement score mean. 2. In each group, five subjects were randomly selected from each of the two Achievement subgroups: the subgroups of the higher and of the lower scores. 3. These subjects' parents constituted the parents' sample. 4. The whole sample of mothers (eighty), but only forty fathers, were interviewed. 5. For each group, besides the ten homes selected for doing the interviews, some additional ones were selected for eventual use to replace the ones previously selected, if necessary.

In order to contact the parents, the schools provided the subjects' addresses. The first contact with the parents occurred either by personal contact, by telephone or by school arrangements of the interview.

The living areas of the families were in accord with their social class, that is, the upper-middle families were living in the most pleasant and residential areas of the town and the upper-lower in the industrial and surrounding areas.

It was not possible to interview four percent of the parents first chosen. These few parents agreed to be interviewed but, as they had too many social or business appointments, they did not have any time for the interview. In these cases, after three trials, they were dropped from the sample. Other missing subjects (about four percent) occurred in cases of families moving out of the city or who had addresses unknown at the school.

Generally speaking, it is possible to say that the parents' attitude toward the interview was good and relaxed, but mothers seemed to be more cooperative than fathers.

Almost all the studies and research accomplished in Brazil in the fields of psychology and education are made through standardized tests; so there are only a few using the technique of interviewing. This happens because Brazilian researchers usually work alone, or with one or two collaborators. Also, there is no great financial support, in Brazil, for research in behavioral sciences. Therefore, due to lack of staff help, collective techniques are easier to use than individual ones.

Some few researchers using this method (Willems, 1953; Maynard Araujo, 1955; Castaldi, 1956; Hutchinson, 1957; Gouveia, 1957; Angelini and Rosen, 1964; Ginsberg, 1964; Aguirre, 1965) do not make explicit references to any special difficulties when they contacted the parents in order to interview them. Therefore, we concluded that if any difficulty appeared, it was probably not great.

The staff of interviewers was made up of four instructors of psychology and two psychology students (last year). Four interviewers were female and two were male. Male interviewers talked with the fathers and females with the mothers.

Before starting the work, the staff studied the interview manual, the items of the interview and performed some interviews for training (four) with parents not included in the sample. After each interview used as training, they discussed the problems that had emerged and made an evaluation of the interview, in order to improve their performance in the interviews with the actual sample.

Methodology

There was no mention in the Brazilian Psychological Reviews of any studies that have obtained this sort of information by this method.

Some researches carried out in Brazil which have produced information relevant to the questions and findings associated with the Cross-National Interview are summarized below according to the topics indicated.

1. Studies of child-rearing practices which report on such topics as child discipline or changes in child-rearing practices, et cetera.

Angelini and Rosen (1964) examined the differences and similarities among three Brazilian cities -- Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro and Americana; and between two countries, Brazil and the United States, in independence training through an interview with the mothers. In relation to independence training, five questions from the Winterbottom questionnaire were posed to the mothers:

- To be active and energetic in climbing, jumping and sports.
- To try hard things for himself without asking for help.
- To make his own friends among children his own age.
- To have interests and hobbies of his own. To be able to entertain himself.
- To make decisions like choosing his clothes or deciding how to spend his money by himself.

The mothers had to indicate the approximate age by which they thought their children should have learned the behavior described in each question. The results obtained showed that independence training is given earlier in the United States than in any Brazilian city. As far as Brazil is concerned, this training is given earlier in larger cities like Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro than in smaller towns like Americana. No significant differences were found related to social class.

2. Studies of family influence on child behavior with particular reference to the extended family structure.

A study using McClelland's projective technique (Angelini, 1967) studied the relation between family structure and achievement motivation. A comparison between the intensity of children's achievement motivation and size of their families indicated that the larger the size of the family, the weaker the achievement motive. Concerning birth order, the results showed that achievement motivation was higher for the single child, followed by the first child, the child in the middle position and, last, the younger child.

3. Studies of parent-child relationships

a. Pierson (1954) verified that in Brazilian rural communities there is a parent-child continuous dependence, often until adulthood. Sometimes grown-up children, even after they got married, stayed in their parents' home and continued to depend morally and economically on them. Parents tended to be indulgent toward their children; in some cases the child received such good treatment that he became dependent to a high degree upon his parents.

b. According to IBOPE data (apud Pfromm Netto, 1968), among young people living in Rio de Janeiro, with ages ranging between fourteen and twenty-five years old, emancipation occurred around twenty years old. Nevertheless, for almost half of them, to be emancipated did not mean living by themselves or earning their own money.

c. A high percentage of young people did not include leaving the parents' home in their concept of emancipation (Mugiatti, 1966).

4. a. Ginsberg (1947) investigated the factors that influence social acceptance and rejection among children and adolescents between six and twenty years of age, attending public schools in Salvador (Bahia State, Brazil). Generally, subjects mentioned the following reasons for seating near some classmates at school: friendship and personal choice, good classroom behavior, good school achievement and, less frequently, prior relationships among families. As far as skin color of the student was concerned, a slight tendency was found for the subjects to choose as friends classmates with their same skin color; this tendency increased with age.

b. Bicudo (1953-1954) studied 4,520 students from nine to fifteen years of age in Sao Paulo. They answered a questionnaire about acceptance--rejection between them and their classmates. This research found a positive correlation between the skin color of the student who rejected and the skin color of the student rejected, but racial prejudice appeared explicitly in only twenty-two percent of justifications for the rejections. Kindness, good behavior, good school achievement and friendship were the motives more frequently mentioned by the students. There were some differences when they were grouped according to sex; kindness was more frequently cited by girls, whereas friendship and good school achievement were more appreciated by boys. Among the causes for rejection, to be a bad student (including to be talkative, lazy, or to copy the lessons from their classmates) was the strongest one, appearing with a higher percentage in the justifications given by the boys.

c. In a study carried out by Brandao (1963) as in the ones mentioned above, among the personality traits which contributed to popularity, being a good friend was frequently mentioned by children and adolescents. Nevertheless, adolescents attributed more importance to "good behavior" in contrast to "misbehavior." On the other hand, "to be a bully" appeared as justification for rejecting a classmate with a higher frequency in the child group than in the adolescent group.

5. Studies of parent involvement in the school community.

Parents' opinion about the teaching of elementary school children was surveyed by Gouveia (1957) in some towns of Rio de Janeiro State. The opinions of 214 parents about the more important aims of school were fairly distributed. The higher percentages were for character formation (twenty-seven percent) and learning to read, write and count (twenty-six percent). According to parents' residence (rural or urban) education level and salary, the expectations in relation to school varied. To learn to read, to write and training for an occupation were more important for rural parents. Character formation and citizen responsibility were more prized by parents living in the city, and of higher educational and salary level. Almost half of the parents said that the schools were fair or good, but censured eagerly certain aspects such as short hours of school, long vacations, overcharged curricula, inappropriate buildings and absence of the teachers. Forty percent considered the school good. The remaining ones were less pleased; they accused school and teachers of failure, making the government responsible for the situation.

It was also observed that the higher the educational level of the parents, the more severe was their judgment of the school.

6. Studies of long- or short-term parental aims for children.

In the previously cited research, Angelini and Rosen (1964) studied also parental aims for children. In this research, mother's level of occupational aspiration was rated by the number of occupations chosen by the mother among eight occupations representing six categories of social status. Surprising similarities were found between Brazil and the United States, and among Brazilian cities. Significant differences were found in relation to social class; mothers from the upper classes aspired to occupations of higher social prestige for their children than did lower class mothers.

References

Aguirre, M.J.B.F. *Significado de alguns fatores psicologicos no rendimento da leitura*, Unpublished Thesis, Universidade de Sao Paulo, 1965.

Angelini, A.L. and Rosen, B.C. Motivacao, Aspiracao Profissional e Alguns Aspectos da Educacao dos Filhos: Estudo Comparativo de dados obtidos no Brasil e nos Estados Unidos, *Pesquisa e Planejamento*, 7, 1964.

Angelini, H. R. C. Estrutura da Familia e Motivo de Realizacao, *Revista Interamericana de Psicologia*, I, 2, 1967.

Bicudo, V. L. Relacoes raciais entre engros e blancos em Sao Paulo, *Anhembi*, XII, XIII, 1953-1954.

Brandao, G. *Sociologia da Educacao*. Sao Paulo: Editora do Brasil, 1963.

Castaldi, C. O Demonio no Catule, *Anhembi*, XXI-XXIII, 1956.

Ginsberg, A. M. Escolha do Companheiro de Carteira, Resultado de um Inquerito entre Escolares Baianos, *Psyke*, 1, 3, 1947.

Ginsberg, A. M. Um Estudo Psicologico de Imigrantes e Migrantes, *Revista de Psicologia Normal e Patologica*, 1-2, 1964.

Gouveia, A. J. A Escola e o Professor na Opiniao dos Pais, *Educacao e Ciencias Sociais*, 2, 5, 1957.

Hutchinson, C.J.A. Notas Preliminares ao Estudo da Familia no Brasil, *Anais da I Reuniao Brasileira de Antropologia*, 1957.

Mugiatti, R.O. Dialogo Impossivel entre Filhos e Pais - Inquerito IBOPE - Manchete, *Manchete*, 743, 1966.

Maynard Araujo, A. A Familia numa Comunidade Alagoana, *Sociologia*, XVII, 1955.

Pfromm Netto, S. *Psicologia da Adolescencia*. Sao Paulo, Pioneira Edit., 1968.

Pierson, D. Familia e Compadrio numa Comunidade Rural Paulista. *Sociologia*, 16, 1954.

Willems, W. The Structure of the Brazilian Family, *Social Forces*, XXXI, 1953.

MEXICO

During the development of the cross-national study, it became apparent to all the participating scientists that we should have access to parents and teachers as important sources of validation criteria for the results obtained in the children. It was decided that a subsample of the parents of the children in the study should prove to be sufficient for the purpose, while not overtaxing the facilities of the research teams.

The criteria of selection implied a combination of random sampling and a criterion that would dichotomize the sample of children with regard to their intelligence as measured by the Raven test. The specific procedure was as follows: for each one of the eight cells of the design, the median Raven score was determined. Then, by a random procedure, five children above the median and five children below the median were chosen.

It was decided to apply the interview to all the eighty mothers in the sample but only to forty of the fathers. This was decided upon the realization that it would be much easier to contact and interview Mexican mothers than it would be to contact and receive the cooperation of the Mexican fathers. At any rate, in the final analysis there were one hundred twenty interviews completed in Mexico. It is important to indicate, however, that the fathers were not actually divided in the same random way as the mothers, since the interview with the fathers was exclusively done in those cases in which it was possible to receive cooperation from them. In all of the eighty cases the mother was questioned in regard to the possibility of interviewing the father, and when this was impossible, those male parent interviews were dropped. Because of this, the father interviews did not completely follow the dichotomous criterion as did the mother interviews. However, it was possible in all eight cells to interview five fathers per cell.

In order to contact the parents for the interview, the first thing that was done was to acquire the information about their addresses and, whenever possible, their telephone numbers. Next, whenever this was at all possible, the people were contacted by telephone in order to obtain an appointment. This procedure was successful in a few cases. The success was more common with the upper-middle parents than with the upper-lower. The more general form of contact was going to the home, as the address was entered in the school records in order to contact the mother of the child. Since the parents of the upper-lower children often lived close to the schools attended by their children, we would send interviewers into the general area in order to systematically knock on the doors of the selected cases. They then would either carry on with the interview if the mother was ready, or else establish an appointment for the interview at a later date. There were extreme cases in which it was necessary to call up to seven times at a given place before the mother could be reached. In the cases where this happened, the interviewers would try to obtain information from the neighbors regarding possible times during which they could reach the mother. This type of approach, however, seldom gave accurate information regarding the time at which one could find the mother at home. These were, however, the exceptional cases. It was frequent that the interviews would be carried out on the very first visit. This was particularly so with the mothers of the upper-lower children, who appeared always more willing and condescending than the mothers in the upper-middle class. In the cases when it was not possible to obtain the interview on the first visit, an appointment was made for a second one. Again, the number of times that this had to be done was significantly greater with the upper-middle class than with the upper-lower class parents. From the very first personal contact with the mother she was asked about the possibilities of also interviewing her husband. Such an opportunity turned out frequently to be a difficult one. Often in the upper-lower class, the fathers could be interviewed only after working hours, and they would, at those particular times, be bored and tired and not very willing to see anybody. Also, in the upper-lower class, significantly more often than in the upper-middle class, the father would visit the home only once a week, and in one case only once per month. This, of course, created difficulty. In some of these cases, the interview of the father had to be abandoned because of the actual inability of finding him for the interview. In the upper-middle class the problem regarding the fathers was the fact that they were always busy. The mothers would sometimes indicate that it was probably difficult if not impossible to get the father for an interview. One of the ways in which these problems were frequently solved was after the mother had explained very thoroughly the nature of the interview to the father. The interviewer would finally get an appointment with the father at his place of work.

The question of where the families lived, and the description of the areas in which they lived, is not easily answered. Mexico City is a large mosaic, in which -- although it is true that the people in the upper-middle and upper economic classes live in residential zones in which there are much more often than not large houses with attractive architectural features and gardens -- upper-lower and even low-class housing may be found interspersed, frequently in the same block or between the blocks of residential houses. However, for our own specific sample, there is one clear difference. While the upper-middle parents were widely dispersed in a large number of residential areas like Pedregal de San Angel, Lomas de Chapultepec, Polanco, Anzures, Ciudad Satelite, Colonia del Valle, et cetera, the parents in the upper-lower tended to be clustered fairly closely around the schools attended by their children. This, of course, indicated that the upper-middle class parents were capable of transporting their children fairly far from their living quarters, while the upper-lower oftentimes were economically unable to do so, and tended to send their children to the closest state school available. The range of areas where these schools for the upper-lower children were located is very great, both topologically (since they would be found just as often in the north as in the south or in the west or in the east of the city, as it would be regarding the appearance of the zone) from very worker-like housing urban zones, made up of small, one-story houses to areas where there is a combination of low class and middle class and even upper class housing.

All parents, regardless of sex and social class, once they accepted the interview, showed themselves cooperative and tended to respond directly and spontaneously to the questions. This was, however, significantly more so with the upper-lower group. Generally, too, the mothers answered more willingly, although more passively, than the fathers. It may be interesting to add, since this was often commented by the interviewers, that the mothers in families where the fathers were not living consistently at their homes tended to insist upon indicating that their husbands were wonderful men but that their frequent absences from their homes were due to economic reasons since their jobs demanded their absences. In a typical Mexican wife's way of expression, they would indicate how much their husbands had to sacrifice themselves in order to keep the home on its economic feet. Actual refusals occurred only twice in the entire sample. In these cases the refusal was extremely clear and insultingly direct. There were at the most two other cases where the parents refused the interview. It was probably not more than four or five percent of the entire population that refused for some reason or another to answer. However, it was necessary to substitute up to ten percent of the interviews originally sampled. The rest of these failures were due to inability to find the addresses of the parents, or in some cases families where there was no father. As indicated in previous lines, the general attitude of the parents with regard to the interview was one of acceptance, sometimes resigned acceptance, since they had been reasonably convinced that what we were doing had to do with matters connected with the education of their children. However, in most cases, the cooperation was open and decided, and there was much interest shown in the questions that were asked. Sometimes, too, the parents would seek further information about the study and the reason for the entire project from the interviewers. These questions were usually answered at the end of the interview. There was greater passivity, as well as a more spontaneous and trusting reacting from the mothers in the upper-lower than from the mothers of the upper-middle class. The latter appeared slightly more inquisitive and even slightly suspicious. However, all mothers ended the interview with a feeling of trust and friendliness toward the interviewers. The fathers were in general more active, a little bit more distrustful, and they showed more restlessness and some amount of nervousness when they were questioned and often interrupted the interviewers to ask the reasons for a given question or the reasons for the entire interview and even for the purposes and reasons of the research. This particular trend was certainly more common in the upper-middle class fathers than in the upper-lower class ones.

If one combines the paucity of research in the behavioral sciences in Mexico with the even greater paucity of information about what is being done, it will not sound strange to say that there has been only one other study in which parents were interviewed with the same amount of care and with the same degree of success in Mexico. This was done by almost the same team of researchers as were utilized in the cross-national. The interviews were connected with the cross-cultural longitudinal study of cognitive and personality development of school children that R. Diaz-Guerrero conducted in collaboration with Dr. Wayne H. Holtzman from The University of Texas. In that study, about two years prior (1965-1966) to the cross-national interviews, about two hundred parents were interviewed. The interview was a modification from the original interview by Wolf, et.al. In this interview there was particular concentration on a number of criteria that might have to do with the cognitive, personality and intellectual development of the children. Furthermore, it included two attitude questionnaires, in order to inquire into the philosophy of training of the children. This entire study was completed and the results have been analyzed but it has not as yet been published. The pattern of difficulties and percent of cooperation in that study was very similar to the present one. There was in Mexico, of course, the semi-literary study of Oscar Lewis and his five families. There was also one early study, by one of our students, Josefina Convers Vergara, in which about twenty-five families from the lowest class in Mexico City were interviewed during the illness of one of their children. In this study the interview was much less sophisticated and there were several other instruments utilized in getting the information. The goal of that particular study was to see the reaction of the parents during a situation of stress being produced by the presence of illness in the family. In this study Convers Vergara got one hundred percent cooperation from the mothers.

All the interviewers in this cross-national study were members of the research team from the Centro de Investigaciones en Ciencias del Comportamiento which grew within the Centro Electronico de Calculo of the National University of Mexico and has been under the direction of R. Diaz-Guerrero. The first interviewers were those that had previous training in interviewing from the cross-cultural study mentioned previously. The plan for the training of others consisted of giving them some readings in interviewing first. Secondly, they accompanied the trained interviewers on three or four occasions, and then they gave the interviews under the supervision of the trained interviewer for two or three more times. Finally, they did their own interviewing. All of the interviewers were advanced undergraduates, graduate students, or recently graduated professional psychologists from the Colegio de Psicologia of the National University of Mexico. Every completed interview was examined by the interviewer and at least one other interviewer and sometimes by Maria Luisa Morales also, in order to check the answers and ask about some of the ways of answering and the way the interviewers had recorded the answers, and so forth. The original interviewers for the IDPEM (the previously cited research) were trained with observation through one-way screens at the old laboratories of the Colegio de Psicologia of the National University of Mexico.

ENGLAND

To select the sample of parents to be interviewed the children in each of the eight subgroups were divided at the median of the Achievement scores (Reading and Mathematics). Children where both parents were not present were eliminated and the sample was then randomly selected, five from each side of the median. Refusals necessitated random replacement from the appropriate half cell, giving a total of eighty mothers.

The head teachers of the schools concerned were most cooperative in giving lists of addresses of the parents who had been sampled. Initially all mothers were contacted by the research associate who visited each address, explained the purpose of the interview and made an appointment for an interviewer to call. An appointment card was left with the mother so she would have a reminder of when the interviewer was coming. If the appointment was made more than two weeks ahead a reminder card was sent through the mail a few days before the actual interview.

At the time of the initial contact the possibility of interviewing the father also was mentioned to the mother but it was made clear that each interview would be carried out separately. In between making the appointment and the actual interview the mother was asked to approach her husband. When the interviewer called, he ascertained whether or not the father was willing to be interviewed and if so made a firm appointment.

The areas in which the families were living were generally representative of the schools in which the testing had been carried out. There were three main areas --predominantly upper middle class, mixed lower middle and upper working and working class.

Two mothers refused to be interviewed, both from the upper middle class grouping, one the mother of a ten-year-old girl, the other of a fourteen-year-old girl. Both refused because they could not see that the study had any direct relevance to their own child and were therefore not interested. Forty-eight fathers agreed to be interviewed, thus leaving thirty-two who were not willing, thirteen from the middle class and nineteen from the working class groups. The main reason given was lack of time. Some fathers did indicate that if an insufficient number of father interviews were obtained they would find the time to be interviewed. It was not necessary to call on them, however, as more than forty father interviews were obtained.

Parents who were interviewed gave readily of their time and were most hospitable on the whole. It was rare for an interviewer to experience the extremes of being offered a steak for lunch at one interview and to be eyed hungrily by a large Alsatian dog throughout the entire period of the next call. Most interviewers experienced situations somewhere in between the two just mentioned.

Several parents proved extremely helpful during the pilot period of the interview, travelling long distances to be interviewed behind one-way screens and in some cases suggesting questions that might be used to supply relevant information.

There was no basic difference in the attitudes of fathers and mothers toward being interviewed.

In one other English study, mothers of a national sample of delinquent boys were interviewed in order to check correspondence with the information given by their sons. The mothers were contacted by the same method as used in the cross-national study. The success rate in the London area was approximately the same as that for the cross-national study.

The interviewers went through very intensive training. As some had already worked on the construction of the interview schedule they were already familiar with both questions and layout. The necessity of intensive knowledge of order and wording were continually stressed so that, if necessary, an interviewer could conduct the interview without using the schedule at all.

Once completely familiar with the schedule each interviewer carried out a number of interviews with other members of the team in order to become used to writing the responses verbatim.

The next step was for each interviewer to carry out an interview with an actual parent behind a one-way screen, observed by the rest of the team. The research associate, who acted as tutor, did the first of these as a demonstration. These interviews were then thoroughly criticized by the observers. Finally, each interviewer carried out at least two practice interviews in the parents' homes and the completed schedules were then gone over with him in some detail before the actual interviewing of the sample commenced.

It should be mentioned here that for each interview two schedules were used. One was used for the actual interview and the interviewer was free to use abbreviations or personal shorthand to get down as much information as possible. As soon as possible after the interview was completed the interviewer wrote up the interview so that it was meaningful and readable.

Throughout the period of the survey a check was kept on completed interviews to make sure that the interviewers maintained the same high standard until the end.

GERMANY

I.

The German Parent Interview differed in some points from the other Cross-National Parent Interviews:

1. Our interviews were carried out two years later than those in the other countries, i.e., April through June 1969.

2. We only interviewed mothers, not fathers.

3. Some items had been deleted in the German interview so that nothing can be said about interpersonal relations in the parent-child interaction area and about academic task achievement of mothers, and only little on personal characteristics of mothers.

Since Germany had combined Stage II and Stage III, mothers of those children were interviewed who had been tested with our modified Stage III instruments.

The following table shows the distribution of our parents in the eight cells for all three stations:

Stations	Variables								
	10				14				
	UW		UM		UW		UM		
	m	f	m	f	m	f	m	f	
H	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	27
Ko	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	28
Hd	2	4	2	3	4	3	3	4	25
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	80

H = Hannover
Ko = Koblenz
Hd = Heidelberg

UW = Upper Working
UM = Upper Middle

m = male
f = female

The mothers were chosen randomly at each station from each subgroup. Parents were contacted either by phone or by personal visit. Very few parents refused to be interviewed (five percent), and generally it was possible to get the consent for one of the following days after the first contact. Parents agreed mainly because they had been informed of the study by their children's having been tested before. Thus, what had been allowed by the head of the school should be "something serious." In order to be sure, however, some parents asked their children "Is that the man who tested you in school?" before letting the interviewer come in. He was in fact the same person as that testing in the classes.

All parents interviewed lived in the center of one of the three cities, the areas being equal to those from which the schools were chosen.

The general attitude of mothers toward the interview was quite positive, i.e., they were interested in the questions and frequently said more than necessary. Middle class mothers tended to answer more freely and naturally, whereas working class mothers often asked whether their replies could have any consequences on the school records.

The interviews were carried out by two graded psychologists, one in each station. Before the interview they met twice in order to go through the questions and to come to an agreement concerning their behavior in the interview situation. Then four pilot interviews were carried out by each in each station; thereafter they met again to come to a final "strategy." Two of the interviewers had had experience interviewing people during their practical courses as students in psychology, and one had already done interviews for an advertising service.

II.

During the last few years there have been a lot of publications in Germany on child-rearing practices, from workers in various fields such as psychologists, sociologists, teachers, and social workers. The works go from scientific studies to more journalistic views on the usefulness of the old traditional forms of education. Two English authors had some influence on the discussion in Germany, one with broad experience in practical education, the other a psycholinguist, who has stimulated many psychologists and sociologists to do similar research in Germany: A.S. Neill and B. Bernstein.

As to the methods for assessing child-rearing attitudes, most studies used questionnaires like the Parent Attitude Research Instrument by Schaefer and Bell, many of those using a short translated version of this instrument (e.g., Keil, W. and Keil, H., 1970). Kemmler (1960) and Kemmler and Heckhausen (1957, 1959) tried to get data on the independence training of German mothers by asking questions similar to those of Winterbottom. Wesley and Karr (1968) used the same set of questions for a comparison of American and German mothers.

Another approach is to ask children about their parents and their child-rearing attitudes and practices. This method, described by Bronfenbrenner, and Roe and Siegelman, has also been used in a variety of German studies (e.g., Hermann et. al., 1968; Minsel and Fittkau, 1971).

Concerning educational practices at home and in the school that can only be assessed by direct observation, we have few studies. Most research in this area was done by Tausch, R. and Tausch, A.M., from Hamburg University, summed up in their book on educational psychology (1970).

The influence of certain child-rearing attitudes on the children's behavior and personality was studied in a number of works, particularly by workers around Heckhausen on the development of motivation (Heckhausen, H., 1965; Heckhausen, et. al., 1966; Heckhausen and Kemmler, 1957; Heckhausen and Roelofsen, 1962; Heckhausen and Wagner, 1965), (Keil, W. and Keil, H., 1970), but also on cognitive variables (Hermann and Stapf, 1968, 1972) and certain personality dimensions like those in the Children Personality Questionnaire by Potter and Cattell (Seitz and Jankowski, 1969).

Generally one can say that no German study concerning the field of parent-child relations has up to now undertaken to get information in so many behavior areas on the child by the interview technique as the cross-national investigation, the results of which are presented below.

ITALY

RODUCTION

The parents were chosen by chance within the sample of children of the first stage so that eighty mothers and forty fathers were selected to be interviewed.

For every one of the eight cells we sampled ten more subjects than necessary, in order to substitute those parents who refused to be interviewed. Only in some cases (fifteen) did the interviewers visit the parents at their homes. The majority of the parents were interviewed at the Institute of Psychology after having contacted them by phone and having fixed a date with them.

The parents belonging to the upper-middle class live in the center or near the center of Milan. The parents belonging to the upper-lower class live in the center or in the outlying areas of the city. The types of areas were substantially the same as those from which the schools were chosen. The parents in general were interested in cooperating in the study. Nine fathers and five mothers (twelve percent) refused to be interviewed, saying that they were too busy. It has been observed that mothers were more willing to cooperate and showed a greater interest than fathers did. Mothers knew their children better and gave in general more exhaustive responses not only as far as the achievement of the child at school but also as far as his attitudes and behavior were concerned. In some cases fathers gave the impression of under-evaluating the importance of the needs of their children and showed a rather rigid attitude as far as the educational system they use.

Compared to other studies in which the subjects were contacted by telephone, our initiative has been more successful, since we obtained a higher percentage of cooperators.

For the interview we selected three psychologists belonging to the permanent staff of the project and two of the best assistant psychologists working at the Institute of Psychology of the Medical Faculty of Milan.

The training was divided in two different stages. In the first stage the five interviewers had several meetings in which they discussed the technique of the interview and the goals of the field work.

The second stage regarded a certain number of pilot interviews (five) carried on by each of the interviewers. After that, another meeting was arranged with the principal investigator and the types of responses were analyzed.

Parents' interview method has already been used in our country in scientific psychological studies.

The Programma IARD of Milan, in connection with the Van Leer Foundation (1969), carried out seventy-two interviews with mothers of children who have been previously tested.

The content of these interviews concerned family influence on child behavior with particular reference to the extended and nuclear family structure and to the parent-child relationship. This study is relevant to our research in the sense that it indicates the relationship between the structure of the family and the parent-child interaction on one hand and the capacity of socialization of the child and his level of academic achievement on the other hand. The results of this research are still unpublished.

Another research carried on in Italy which is relevant to our study is that of Migliorini and Peterson (see Child Development, Vol. 38, n. 4, 1967). In this study seventy-one mothers and seventy-one fathers of Palermo (Sicily) and an equal number in Champaign (Illinois) have been interviewed following schedules adapted from those of Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) in order to study the common and the different patterns of behavior of Italian and American parents. The results of this study show that Sicilian parents differ from parents in the United States mainly in the severity of the control they exercise over their children. Furthermore, American permissiveness for aggression toward parental authority, as well as encouragement of aggression toward peers, are substantially greater than in the Sicilian culture.

YUGOSLAVIA

INTRODUCTION

The parents were chosen by chance, so that eighty mothers and forty fathers were chosen to be interviewed. The interviewers visited the parents who were chosen at their homes and asked them to participate in the study. The parents lived in the center or near the center of the city of Ljubljana. The types of areas were the same as those from which the schools were chosen.

The parents were interested in cooperating with the study, in general. Only three fathers (2.5 percent) refused to be interviewed, giving as an excuse that they were too busy. It was observed that mothers were more willing to cooperate and showed somewhat more interest than did the fathers.

Mothers knew their children better and gave, in general, more exhaustive responses, especially concerning the achievment of the child at school. Fathers frequently said that mothers usually visited parent-teacher meetings and, therefore, knew more about the child.

For the interview the best students of psychology who were in the last year course were selected. The interviews were done by four students. Each of the students interviewed twenty mothers and ten fathers.

The training consisted of the following: first, the authors discussed with the students each question in the interview in detail; secondly, a preliminary interview with two mothers and one father was made. After that, another meeting with the students was arranged and the types of responses were analyzed.

Finally, we have no scientific study dealing with problems of family influence on child behavior and other problems dealing with the interview.

CHICAGO, U.S.A.

This section will detail the procedures used in locating and getting cooperation from parents, of children tested in Stage I, to be interviewed for Stage II, and will describe the interviewers and their training.

As explained in the Introductory Country Chapter in Volume I, the Chicago station had some difficulty in maintaining school system cooperation with the project and this greatly affected the procedures and success of our Stage II sampling. Ideally we would have (1) divided the student sample from Stage I into high and low achievers within each of the eight Age-Sex-SES groups, (2) taken their parents' names and addresses from the school files, and (3) randomly selected from each half an order of parents to approach for interviewing with credentials from the school approving and promoting our efforts. The circumstances for Stage II interview sampling were far from ideal and differed in the two school system areas, Gary and Flossmoor. In Gary we received cooperation on this task from the schools although it was somewhat limited. We gave the system a list of twenty names of children from each of the eight groups (if we had that many in a group) and they gave us the parents' names and addresses for these children. The system would not sanction the interviewing however.

We then sent the attached Letter A to the parents with their name and the name of the child typed in the appropriate space. A member of the interviewing staff visited the home a few days later, interviewed then, if possible, or tried to make an appointment. What followed then was a series of personal or telephone calls attempting to make an appointment for an interview. This continued until we were definitely rejected or accepted. Since the system would not supply us with additional names and addresses we tried to find other parents by matching children's last name, parents' last name and neighborhood. This was barely worth the effort except for the three parents interviewed whom we located in this way.

The range of area in Gary in which we interviewed covered the full house type, neighborhood range. Reports by interviewers best sum it up. One said she felt "shabby" interviewing a woman in such a magnificent home, whereas in some cases we had a male accompany a female interviewer because it was not considered safe for her to travel in the area alone.

In Flossmoor a somewhat different approach had to be taken. The school system would not help us at all. In fact we were asked not to mention the previous testing. Therefore we sent a letter to all people we could determine from telephone listings and maps as having the same last name as and living in the school district as one of our subjects. This meant sending many more letters than we had subjects and it was not feasible to follow these letters up personally. We enclosed a return card. If the card was returned saying that they had a child in our age ranges we interviewed the parent. If no card was received we sent a followup letter and card. (One result of this procedure was that we interviewed parents of children not in our sample, which were, of course, of no use to us.)

This procedure makes it impossible to say how many parents were actually contacted, or how many actively refused by choice or passively refused to be interviewed by neglect or happenstance. The Gary parents who were interviewed knew their children had participated in the study and would therefore seem to have a greater interest in the study. The Flossmoor parents who were interviewed did so because of interest or civic duty but not as much for personal reasons.

The interviewers were six graduate students at the University of Chicago. They were all members of the Cross-National Study staff at that time and had been selected for a variety of reasons, not just interviewing experience on which they varied from slight to nil.

The training was conducted first in a classroom fashion in which we read and discussed the meanings of the interview schedule, techniques and scoring. Role playing was used with the interviewers interviewing one another as if they were parents, followed by discussion of their role playing. Lastly each interviewer administered the interview to a local parent, not from our sample.

At the conclusion of the training the interviewers had all reached a high level of agreement on style, approach, and content for the interviews. It would appear that supervision over the interviewers was not adequate (it was the responsibility of this author) and that the level reached in training was not in all cases maintained in the actual interviewing.

LETTER A

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Committee on Human Development
5801 S. Kenwood Ave. Phone: 288-5565
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Mr. and Mrs.

Last year the staff of the project entitled "Coping Styles and Achievement: A Cross-National Study of Children" tested approximately 1500 children, 50 classes, in the Gary school system. We, at the University of Chicago, are one testing station on this project that is being conducted elsewhere in the United States and in six foreign countries. All of the children tested around the world answered the same questions. The questions were about their behavior in various situations relating to school achievement, and their educational and occupational goals.

Your took these tests. The next phase of our project is to interview parents of the children tested. We want to ask parents questions that are generally the same as those we asked their children. The interview will take approximately an hour and would be conducted at your home at your convenience by a member of our staff.

The interview will be strictly confidential. In fact, we promised the children that their answers would be confidential, also, and the interviewers will not know how your child responded to these questions.

The U.S. Office of Education supports this project and the School System of Gary has been assisting it. The project will hopefully give educators a better idea of children's behavior and its effect on their school work, their hopes and plans, and the amount of agreement between children and their parents on these questions.

If you agree to participate in this study, we believe you will not only spend an interesting hour being interviewed but you will also be helping in a worldwide effort to improve education.

One of our staff will call you in the next few days to answer your questions and make arrangements for your interview.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Guy J. Manaster
Project Director

GJM/f

LETTER B

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Committee on Human Development
5801 S. Kenwood Ave. Room 205
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Mr. and Mrs.

The U.S. Office of Education in Washington, D.C. is conducting a study of the way children deal with problems and how this relates to their school achievement, and educational and occupational aims. This study is being conducted in two places in the U.S. and in six foreign countries. We, at the University of Chicago, are carrying out this study in the Chicagoland area. The study has potential value for the improvement of education for all children in the U.S. and for school systems around the world, as well as important theoretical implications in social science.

"Coping Styles and Achievement: A Cross-National Study of Children" is the title of the research project. It will run for five years with numerous phases including testing in schools, interviewing teachers and interviewing parents. We are currently beginning the phase in which we interview parents.

The interview will be given to parents of children 10-11, and 14-15 years old and will ask them questions about the way their children deal with situations in and out of school, and how the parents deal with these situations also. All of the information will be kept strictly confidential. We are not investigating a single child or a single family. We are interested in the way situations are handled and educational and occupational goals are formed by different groups of Americans in general.

For this reason Flossmoor is one of the groups we are going to sample as typical of a good suburban community. We are writing to you now in the hope that you will cooperate with us and become part of this sample.

The interview will take about an hour. We would like to give it to each of you but will be satisfied if only one of you participate. If either, or both, of you are interested in being interviewed or desire further information concerning the interview, please mark the enclosed postcard appropriately and send it to us. We will call you.

By participating in this phase of the project you will not only be donating about an hour of your time to the future of education, but you should enjoy an interesting educational experience as well.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Guy J. Manaster
Project Director

GJM/f
Enclosure

AUSTIN

The parents of ten percent of the children who had been studied in Stage I were to be interviewed in Stage II. The purpose was to try to identify parental characteristics and child-rearing practices which might be etiologically related to the patterns of coping behavior and attitudes found in the children.

At the Austin station, the chief work was done in developing the detailed interview schedule for the interviews which were to be conducted in all countries. Once a detailed format had been worked out in draft form, it was circulated to all stations for their comments and the appropriate revisions.

Thereafter, three sets of interviewers were recruited, Black, Latin-American and Anglo-American, for the purpose of interviewing Austin parents in each ethnic group. Intensive, continuing training was given these interviewers. After several hours of discussion of the interview schedule, each interviewer conducted several interviews with adults who were not members of the research sample. These interviews were carefully reviewed by Dr. Hereford and the other staff members who conducted this phase of the research. Where the interviewers were not able to perform with full adequacy, replacements were secured. After the training interviews were completed, and the research interviews began, these interviews were sampled, reviewed for adequacy, and used for the continued training of the interviewers.

The sample was selected on the basis of the achievement records of the children who had been tested in Stage I. The children in each of the eight cells in the Anglo-American sample, for instance, were divided at the median for that cell on their composite achievement score (the average of their standardized Mathematics and Reading Achievement scores). Each cell was thus divided into a top and bottom half, on child achievement. The ultimate aim was to obtain interviews with ten parents in each cell, five from the top half and five from the bottom half. In order to be sure of enough complete interviews, a random selection was made of thirty children from the top half of the cell and thirty from the bottom half of the cell. Interviews were sought with the mothers of the children on this list until complete interviews were obtained with five mothers of high-achieving children in each cell, and five mothers of low-achieving children in each cell.

Since interviews were also sought with half as many fathers, three fathers of high-achieving children and two of low-achieving children were targeted as informants. Thus, one condition for the selection of the mothers whose interviews ultimately were used, was the availability of an interview with the father in half of the families where the mother could be interviewed.

The chief practical problem was arranging appointments to meet with mothers and fathers to discuss the purpose of the interviewing and to set up a time to conduct it. Needless to say, it was far harder to contact fathers and arrange for the interview than to reach the mothers. The actual refusal rate was very low. Once an interviewer had been able to meet with the parent or parents, it was possible to set up a subsequent interview with very few refusals.

Once the parents understood the purpose of the study and of the interview, they generally evidenced real personal interest. There were no complaints following any of the interviews that it had invaded family privacy, touched on unduly sensitive issues, or otherwise offended or upset either parent. Unquestionably, considerable credit for this positive outcome must be given to the tact and good judgment of the selected interviewers, and to the extreme care and alertness with which the interviewer training was conducted, throughout the study. Another factor which probably helped was the care taken to match the ethnicity of the interviewer to the ethnic background of the parents to be interviewed. It was not solely a matter of putting the parents at ease. We found that the interviewers of a given ethnic group had a good many points of special knowledge and insight which made it possible for them to probe beyond overly-general answers, or rephrase questions in such a way as to elicit much more full and frank statements from the parents, within the natural limits of frankness which any such interviewing inevitably encounters.

In the end, a ten percent sample of parents from each of the eight cells in the Anglo-American sample were interviewed. All of the mothers in this sample were interviewed, and half of the fathers, in each cell. In the Latin-American and Black samples, twenty percent of the mothers and ten percent of the fathers in each of the cells were interviewed. This was done in order to achieve the same number of respondents as in the Anglo-American sample, which was the minimum number necessary for statistical analysis.

JAPAN

This is a brief review of the educational situations, the parents' educational concerns, and the sampling method of interviewed parents which may be needed for the understanding of Japanese interview data.

Educational Situations and Parents' Educational Concerns in Japan

In Japan where social mobility is great, what decides the future of children is, first of all, their school career. That is, if someone receives only compulsory education, it is an unfavorable condition to him while graduation from a well-reputated university means very much for him. Therefore, even the parents of lower social status want to send their children to college and/or university, though they themselves could not receive higher education. Thus, some characteristic features appear concerning Japanese education. Firstly, what is important is not the academic abilities children get in university, but the diploma they get there. The situation is not different even in case of girls, either. That is, if a girl has a poor academic career, she is handicapped in finding a mate who has a brilliant future prospect. Now, most universities confer diplomas to their students as long as they stay there for a required number of years and pay their tuition, no matter whether they study hard or not. Therefore, what parents aim at is nothing but to send their children to a well-reputated university. In order to achieve this aim, they have to send their children to an upper secondary school which successfully sends many of its graduates to well-known universities. Then, in order to enter a well-reputated upper secondary school, their children must be in a well-known lower secondary school, many of whose graduates go to a well-reputated upper secondary school. Every time children enter a higher level of school, they have to go through a highly competitive entrance examination. In order to have children pass the exam, a tremendous amount of preparatory education is given, which often makes them sacrifice the development of their character, health, sociability, and creativity. This is done even at the age of kindergarten in its extreme cases. One could say it is desperately done all over Japan.

Such defect, tragedy, or disgrace of Japanese education has certainly given many ill effects to several aspects of our society. Yet, the parents and the whole society must recognize the existence of the system. Needless to say, there is much criticism of it, and many reform plans have been proposed. As this is a problem, however, where the interests of various kinds of people are entangled with each other, reform campaigns have always resulted in going halfway and being ineffective. In other words, it may be said that our society still approves the existence of the system, though there are many complaints about it as well.

What parents request of teachers may be easily understood from the previous statements. That is, they ask teachers to assist their children and have them successfully enter a well-reputated school of higher level. On the side of the school, teachers well know the parents' desire and usually try to cooperate with them. Nevertheless, not a small number of teachers maintain noble, humanistic ideals. But there are many barriers which restrict their efforts to put their ideals into practice.

Sampling Method

First, each of the eight subgroups studied in the First Stage was divided into good and poor groups by pupil's academic achievement. As all the sample pupils of both ages in Japan had been given the mathematics test and the Japanese language test made by the Ministry of Education, each pupil's scores of the two tests were added together and the medium of the composite scores was obtained for each subgroup. Before the scores of the two tests were added, the scores were converted so that the full score would be the same in both tests. Thus, at the obtained medium point, each subgroup was split into two groups concerning pupils' academic achievement. From each of thus-obtained sixteen subgroups, five pupils were random-sampled and their mothers were interviewed. That is, eighty pupils, ten percent of the eight hundred Stage I sample pupils, were sampled and their mothers were made the sample for the mother's interview. Then the fathers of the half of the sampled pupils were also made the sample for the father's interview. When fathers were sampled, in Subgroup One three fathers were taken out of the five whose children were good academic achievers and two out of the five whose children were poor academic achievers while in Subgroup Two, two were taken from good achievers and three from poor ones. This procedure was repeated in each set of Subgroups Three and Four, Five and Six, and Seven and Eight.

SECTION III

FINDINGS: INTERCOUNTRY ANALYSES

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT:
A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The University of Texas at Austin

1974

FINDINGS: INTERCOUNTRY ANALYSES

VALIDITY OF MOTHERS' REPORTS OF THEIR CHILDREN'S ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

The correlations in Table 1 for Hypothesis 3 indicate that only in England, at age ten, was there a significantly large correlation between mothers' reports of academic performance and their children's Raven scores. At fourteen years, there were correlations which approached significance in Italy, Yugoslavia, and Austin. Thus, with only these partial exceptions, the mothers did not assess their children's academic effectiveness by their intellectual capacity or potential.

Rather, the mothers of the ten-year-olds appeared to be basing their assessments on some knowledge of their children's actual school performance, in all stations except Brazil, Italy, and Chicago, as the correlations bearing on Hypothesis 14 in Table 1 illustrate. Even here, the correlations approached a really substantial level only in England, Yugoslavia, and Austin. The mothers of the fourteen-year-olds showed some knowledge of their children's actual performance, as estimated by their Mathematics Achievement scores, in Mexico, Italy, Yugoslavia, and Chicago. Even here, the correlations were modest, at best. At this age, mothers in Brazil, England, Germany, Austin, and Japan evaluated their children's academic success in ways that had almost nothing to do with the children's mathematics skills.

Taking Reading Achievement as the criterion, as in Hypothesis 25, there were more significant correlations, and larger ones, than in the case of Mathematics. The mothers' estimates of academic performance achieved or approached significant correlations with Reading Achievement in all stations but Italy, at age ten. The mothers of the fourteen-year-olds, again, showed a lesser degree of acquaintance with the children's actual school performance. Their ratings did not correlate with Reading Achievement in England, Italy, Chicago or Japan, although there were significant correlations of moderate size in the other five stations.

As might be expected, since teacher grades are commonly reported to parents in some form, the mothers in all stations gave performance ratings on their children which correlated significantly, and quite substantially in many cases, with GPA. This was true at age fourteen, as well, except for Mexico and Japan. The correlations were somewhat lower than at age ten in Brazil, Germany, Italy, and Austin but they were even higher at age fourteen in England and Yugoslavia. Thus, the general tendency was for mothers to be more fully aware of their children's school performance at the ten-year-old level than at the fourteen-year-old level, except in England, Yugoslavia, and Chicago.

When the Peer Behavior Rating on Academic Achievement was correlated with maternal ratings, as for Hypothesis 45, there were significant, positive correlations in six of the nine stations. The correlations were insignificant in Germany and Italy, and the BRS data were unusable in Mexico. The mothers of the fourteen-year-olds in Brazil, England, Yugoslavia, and Chicago showed as great or greater correspondence with peer judgments, and the mothers of Italian fourteen-year-olds joined their ranks. The mothers of the German adolescents still did not correspond with peers in their judgments and the mothers of fourteen-year-olds in Austin and Japan showed no significant correlation with peer ratings.

Conclusions

1. In most national samples, the mothers' appraisals reflected a greater knowledge of teacher evaluations, as reflected in GPA, than of the actual mastery of subject matter skills their children had achieved.

2. The mothers' appraisals corresponded more closely to their children's reading performance than to their mathematics performance.

3. Mothers' appraisals tended to correspond with peer judgments in most countries, particularly for ten-year-olds, but this correspondence was not as strong as the correspondence of mother ratings with children's Grade Point Averages.

4. Instead of a consistent, universal tendency for mothers of fourteen-year-olds to be less in tune with their children's agemates than mothers of ten-year-olds, the reverse actually was true in four of the eight countries where the comparison was made. Mothers of fourteen-year-olds agreed better with their children's peers in England, Italy, Yugoslavia, and Chicago than did the mothers of the ten-year-olds in those places. The reverse occurred in Austin and Japan, where the mothers of the fourteen-year-olds did not match at all with their children's peers in judging their children's academic effectiveness.

VALIDITY OF MOTHERS' REPORTS OF THEIR CHILDREN'S SPECIFIC COPING SKILLS

The data for the following observations are listed in Table 1, for Hypotheses 12 through 44. "Validity" was estimated here by noting the occurrence of significant correlations between mother reports of various child coping skills and the performance criteria. Where even a few national samples showed significant correlations between maternal report and the criterion, this was taken as an indication of some modest degree of validity in those places, for the mothers' reports. Elsewhere, where there was no correspondence between mother ratings and child performance, the maternal estimates of child coping skills probably should be considered invalid.

In the realm of Academic Task Achievement the correlations of mother ratings on Engagement, Initiative, and Persistence showed significant correlations with Mathematics Achievement in only a few instances. Among the ten-year-olds, maternal reports did correlate significantly with the child's mathematics performance in Brazil, England and Yugoslavia, as the data for Hypothesis 12 indicate. For the fourteen-year-olds, there was a significant correspondence only in England and Germany. The findings for Hypothesis 13 indicate that there was practically no correspondence between maternal reports of Child Initiative and the child's performance in mathematics. Hypothesis 15, concerning Persistence, actually found a near-significant negative correlation occurring in Chicago, although there were positive correlations in Mexico, in Yugoslavia, and a near-significant positive correlation in Austin at age ten. For the fourteen-year-olds, there were no significant correlations whatever. Overall, maternal ratings on specific coping skills bore little relationship to Mathematics Achievement.

The picture was no more solid when Reading Achievement was used as the criterion. Maternal ratings of Child Engagement correlated significantly only in Japan at age ten, and not quite significantly at fourteen in Germany. There were significant correlations between maternal ratings on Initiative and Reading Achievement in only one country at ten and one at fourteen. There was a little bit more correspondence between maternal ratings of Persistence and Reading Achievement. At ten, significant correlations occurred in Mexico and Austin; at fourteen, in England and Japan, as the findings for Hypothesis 26 indicate.

When Grade Point Average became the criterion, as in Hypotheses 36 through 44, mothers' ratings of Engagement at age ten correlated significantly with GPA only in Japan; but at fourteen there were significant correlations in Germany, Italy, and Yugoslavia. Similarly, for Initiative at age ten only Chicago showed a significant correlation; but at fourteen, mother reports correlated significantly in Brazil, Yugoslavia,and Chicago. Mother ratings on Persistence showed significant positive correlations at ten in Brazil and Japan; at fourteen, the positive correlation held up in Brazil but a significant negative correlation appeared in Germany.

All in all, maternal ratings of such characteristics as Engagement, Initiative, and Persistence in dealing with homework or other forms of school work, proved to bear only a slight correspondence to measures of actual school performance. As will be discussed a little further on, this could well be due to the strongly skewed distributions of maternal ratings on many of these variables. (See Appendix B , Section VI in Volume I).

The Hypotheses in Table 1 which bear on coping skills in the area of Nonacademic Task Achievement, such as home chores or out-of-school work, showed almost no correspondence between maternal ratings and the criterion measures of school performance. That is, maternal ratings on Initiative, Implementation, or even Coping Effectiveness when their children were dealing with out-of-school tasks correlated either not at all or sometimes negatively with school performance. This was particularly true in England where, at both ages, the children whose mothers saw them carrying out home chores dependably were less likely to get good mathematics grades; and at fourteen they were less likely to get good reading grades. There were no significant correlations, or enough to count, between maternal ratings on coping skills in the Nonacademic area as compared with GPA.

A tentative conclusion might be drawn from these findings that work habits are not necessarily generalized from in-school to out-of-school tasks. Indeed, at least in some countries, such as England, Mexico, and Germany, the children whose mothers rated them higher on the Initiative, Persistence, and overall Coping Effectiveness they showed at home tasks were less likely to show these characteristics in school; or, at least, their school performance was likely to be less effective than that of children who were not as dedicated in their approach to home tasks.

Maternal ratings on Coping Effectiveness with respect to Authority, Interpersonal Relations, Anxiety, and Aggression showed no meaningful number of significant correlations with the children's actual school performance, when the criteria were Mathematics or Reading Achievement. There was a slight relationship, in a few countries, when teacher grades were the criterion but the correlations were even negative in certain instances. There appears to have been little or no generalization of coping skill across the five behavior areas, at least insofar as maternal reports showed any meaningful correspondence with school performance. Of course, alternatively, the doubtful validity of the maternal descriptions may have accounted for this lack of a generalized pattern.

VALIDITY OF MOTHERS' REPORTS OF CHILDREN'S COPING EFFECTIVENESS

Hypotheses 45 to 101 in Table 1 bear on this issue in their various ways. The most direct test was the comparison of maternal ratings on Coping Effectiveness in a given area with peer BRS ratings in the same behavior area. Thus, Hypothesis 45 matched the peer rating on Academic Coping Effectiveness with the maternal report of the Child's Academic Effectiveness. The findings on Hypothesis 45 have already been reported. They showed a significant, positive relationship between maternal report and peer rating everywhere but Germany and Italy at age ten, and everywhere but Germany, Austin, and Japan at age fourteen. In this one aspect of behavior, maternal reports do appear to have been reasonably accurate.

The picture is quite otherwise for all of the other areas of behavior. Hypothesis 54 compared the peer rating on Nonacademic Coping Effectiveness with the maternal report. There were no significant correlations at all at age ten, and only two at fourteen, in Chicago and Austin. In general, if the highly reliable pooled judgment of agemates be taken as a reasonably accurate criterion, the judgment of mothers about their children's Coping Effectiveness with non-school tasks either was quite inaccurate or dealt with tasks which were quite different from the ones the agemates saw each other performing.

Hypothesis 63 tested the relationship between peer and maternal reports of Interpersonal Effectiveness. There was only one significant correlation at age ten, in Austin, with a near-significant but negative correlation in Japan. At fourteen there was only one significant positive correlation, in Italy. The mothers' reports of their children's ability to get along with agemates appeared to have been largely invalid in almost all countries, at both ages, by the testimony of the children's classmates. The mothers may have seen them interacting with different children in the home neighborhood than the ones they went to school with. If so, there was no similarity in the children's social adjustment in the two settings.

Hypothesis 73 tested the relationship between peer and maternal reports of children's ability to cope with anxiety. There was only one significant positive correlation at age ten and two near-significant negative correlations, one at age ten and one at age fourteen. Once again, maternal reports of their children's ability to cope with anxiety were not at all borne out by the peer reports.

Hypothesis 82 tested the relationship between maternal and peer reports on the children's ability to cope with authority. There were no significant correlations and only two near-significant ones. The maternal ratings were not validated by the peer ratings.

Hypothesis 92 tested the relationship between peer and maternal ratings of children's ability to cope with aggression. There was only one significant correlation at either age and it was a negative one. Here, too, the mothers' judgments of their children were not at all borne out by the pooled judgment of schoolmates.

As Appendix B, Section VI, in Volume I shows, the maternal ratings on many of these coping skills were heavily skewed. The mothers in Japan, for example, when rating their children for Engagement with academic tasks had a group mean of 2.93 on a 3.0 scale. This left almost no room for variance among children at either age in Japan, on this variable. Indeed, the lowest mean, in England, was still 2.44 on the 3.0 scale. Similar skewing, favoring positive ratings for the children, was found on many of the other scales. The effect was not universal, however, in all areas and it was not as great for the Coping Effectiveness scales as for the more minutely described scales for specific coping skills. Thus, the maternal ratings on Coping Effectiveness in the Academic Task Achievement area, which has a scale of 1 to 5, had a low mean in Italy of 2.9, with a standard deviation of a high mean in Mexico of 3.79.

In the area of Nonacademic Tasks the mothers were much more realistic, in the sense that they gave a mean score which was just about the mid-point of the scale, when they rated their children on Initiative. They were a little positive (a little above the mid-point in the mean score they assigned) in rating Implementation in Chicago, Austin, and Japan; a little bit higher still in Mexico, Germany, and Yugoslavia; and highest in Brazil, England, and Italy. The Coping Effectiveness ratings in all stations had means above the scale mid-point. This effect was least pronounced in Mexico, only slightly more pronounced in Austin and Japan but most pronounced in Brazil, followed by England, Italy, Yugoslavia, and Chicago. It is undoubtedly worth noting that an appreciable percentage of children holding outside jobs was reported only in the U.S. A much smaller percentage was reported in England. A few boys were reported holding outside jobs in Mexico; a very few girls in Japan; and none whatever in Brazil. Thus, the referent for the question varied considerably from country to country, no doubt implying paid, outside work for an appreciable number of mothers in the United States but only home duties in Brazil and in some of the other countries.

In the area of Authority there was some skewing on the maternal ratings for Engagement, giving a mean score to the children above the scale mid-point. There was an opposite skewing in their ratings of Affect. Mothers in all countries except Japan reported their children showing feelings toward the negative side in reacting to people in authority. The Coping Effectiveness ratings did not show any appreciable skewing in any of the countries with regard to Authority. Consequently, skewing cannot explain the lack of correlation between maternal reports and peer or self-reports in this area of behavior.

Interpersonal Relationships showed something of a skewing on Stance, a quite normal distribution of maternal ratings for Engagement, and a somewhat skewed distribution of Affect scores (understandably leaning to the negative side since the situations presented were all problematical). Probably for the same reason, the interview-based maternal ratings of Coping Effectiveness had means somewhat below the mid-point on the scale except for Yugoslavia and Chicago where the mean fell just at about the scale mid-point.

Summing up, mothers slightly underestimated their children's ability to cope with problems of interpersonal relationships, apparently, but they distributed their ratings in a normal fashion. There was not enough skewing to explain a lack of correspondence with peer or self-reports. In the area of Anxiety, German and Japanese mothers gave their children very high ratings for Stance, Engagement, and Coping Effectiveness. Conversely, mothers in Brazil and Italy tended to rate their children below average for coping with anxiety in respect to Stance, Engagement and overall Coping Effectiveness.

It is worth noting that these highly optimistic ratings by German and Japanese mothers go contrary to the evidence reported in Volume V, based on the firsthand data from the children themselves. It is precisely in Germany and Japan that the children show considerable signs of inner strain when faced with anxiety-creating situations. It is true, particularly in Japan, that they *act* in such a way as to handle the external problems, but this does not appear to reduce their inner tension to a comfortable degree. It would appear that the mothers of the children in both of these countries do not recognize this conflict between an apparent skill and an inner uneasiness of considerable proportions. This issue is explored more thoroughly in the overall summary of this study in the final chapter of Volume I.

In the area of Aggression, the mothers in all countries rated their children slightly below the mid-point of the scale for Engagement, toward the negative side of Affect, as is quite understandable, but all rated their children below the mid-point in ability to cope with aggression. This was particularly true in Brazil, England, and Japan, and for boys in Germany.

Conclusions

1. The mothers in most countries reported their children's coping skills in a way that was modestly correlated with peer perceptions, but solely in the realm of Academic Achievement.

2. There was almost no significant relationship between maternal reports and peer reports in any of the other areas of behavior.

In summary, the mothers gave a quite inaccurate picture in the interviews of how well their children cope with peer relationships, with people in authority, with anxiety and with interpersonal aggression. The precise reason for this lack of validity cannot be stated with assurance,of course, but the most likely alternatives would seem to be either that the mothers simply don't know very much about how their children compare with other children in coping effectiveness in all these ways, or they distort their picture of their own child rather greatly and thus fail to see what he really is able to do, or *how* he accomplishes it, when he does. The skewing of the maternal ratings undoubtedly accounts for some of the missing validity which would be expected. This evidence would tend to support the "distortion" theory. Nevertheless, there was a lack of validity even when the maternal ratings were normally distributed, which tends to indicate that the mothers really may not have a very clear or precise picture of their children's style and level of coping skill in these several important aspects of life, except in academic performance where they receive direct, periodic reports from the school.

COMPARABILITY OF MOTHERS' REPORT AND CHILD'S REPORT OF THE CHILD'S COPING STYLE

In the data shown for Hypotheses 102 through 137, only two out of the thirty-five comparisons show a significant correlation between mother report and child report in as many as three countries.

Hypothesis 116 tested the relationship between maternal report and self-report on the Sentence Completion for engaging with anxiety-arousing problems. There were significant correlations of .30 to .45 in Brazil, Mexico, and Italy; but there was also a significant negative correlation of -.34 in Japan. This is a separate bit of evidence which further tends to support the interpretation that Japanese mothers may not really recognize and understand their children's inner feelings about dealing with anxiety-arousing situations.

Hypothesis 137 tested the relationship between maternal report and Story Completion self-report of Affect about aggressive encounters. There were significant correlations of .29 to .35 in Yugoslavia, Austin, and Japan; but there was a negative correlation of -.23 in Italy.

Overall there was almost no correspondence between the children's self-perceived reports of their own coping styles and their mothers' perceptions of their coping styles.

Two exceptions to this general pattern do appear in Table 1. One emerges from the correlation of maternal reports with the children's self-descriptions from the Social Attitudes Inventory (Stage I form). The other piece of evidence comes from the matching of maternal reports with certain Sentence Completion scores.

The evidence in Table 1, for Hypotheses 48, 49, 56, and 65, shows an appreciable degree of relationship among the mother's ratings of her child's academic achievement, of his nonacademic achievement, and of his interpersonal relationship skills. With respect to Task Achievement, children who were rated highly by their mothers tended not to score themselves high for behaving in an actively defensive manner in Brazil, Italy, Chicago, Austin or Japan, varying somewhat by age. Similarly, children whose mothers rated them high on Academic Achievement did not tend to rate themselves as passively defensive if they came from Italy or Chicago at age ten, or from Yugoslavia or Austin at age fourteen. Children whose mothers rated them as good copers with non-school tasks rated themselves highly as passive copers at age ten in England, Yugoslavia, Austin, and Japan, while at age fourteen they tended to rate themselves as not being passive copers if they lived in Austin. Children rated high by their mothers for coping well with interpersonal issues tended to rate themselves as passive copers in Brazil, Yugoslavia, Japan, Chicago, and Austin, depending on age, as Hypothesis 65 indicates. Thus, there was some correspondence, albeit a somewhat indirect and complex one, between child-described coping

Table 1

COMPARISON OF MATERNAL INTERVIEW DATA WITH CHILD CHARACTERISTICS

Maternal Reports of Child Coping Correlated with Actual Child Achievement and Coping Scores

Correlations With Achievement	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND[1] P <
Hypothesis 1. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (Stage I - Var. 1) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Engagement (Stage II - Var. 102).	10	-13	-01	$\underline{30}$	-04	-02	13	(-28)	04	-16	19
	14	06	13	24	-12	13	06	-21	-18	$-\underline{31}$	23
Hypothesis 2. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Initiation (103).	10	-05	12	$\underline{55}$	-19	-00	02	12	(27)	-13	$\underline{01}$
	14	$\underline{44}$	-06	15	-07	05	-23	14	$\underline{30}$	-15	(08)
Hypothesis 3. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (105).	10	-03	29	$\underline{48}$	11	21	03	08	23	16	17
	14	10	10	01	17	(30)	(30)	11	(28)	21	77
Hypothesis 4. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Persistence (106).	10	11	16	-09	15	-20	18	(-30)	08	23	25
	14	-16	10	18	09	10	06	15	08	-13	66
Hypothesis 5. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Initiation (109).	10	-06	-21	-19	-14	-21	18	-27	06	-03	61
	14	07	-20	-16	$-\underline{32}$	-23	12	-01	-03	-04	86
Hypothesis 6. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Implementation (110).	10	-22	05	-12	09	-14	25	08	-02	07	56
	14	09	-17	-20	-03	-16	01	-05	-15	-17	88
Hypothesis 7. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (111)	10	-14	-18	-02	X	-10	-15	22	-09	02	75
	14	26	01	$-\underline{30}$	X	10	-08	10	-15	$\underline{30}$	(09)
Hypothesis 8. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Authority: Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	-03	-11	-12	20	06	-01	23	14	-15	70
	14	11	-09	06	05	16	19	-08	03	(28)	79
Hypothesis 9. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	-03	09	-19	06	05	-01	08	-05	$-\underline{32}$	50
	14	-00	26	-02	02	15	26	-09	07	18	70
Hypothesis 10. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Anxiety: Coping Effectiveness (125).	10	12	02	07	$\underline{38}$	23	-03	03	10	-25	63
	14	08	10	15	05	-10	-13	15	-07	07	83
Hypothesis 11. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Aggression: Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	-16	-10	-12	-18	09	-03	17	-08	02	86
	14	-15	$\underline{41}$	18	-05	-16	-02	03	07	05	30
Hypothesis 12. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Engagement (102).	10	$\underline{34}$	17	$\underline{44}$	-01	-03	$\underline{39}$	-08	08	19	$\underline{03}$
	14	-02	-02	(29)	$\underline{32}$	15	08	18	-14	12	55
Hypothesis 13. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Initiation (103).	10	-02	(28)	$\underline{47}$	22	-00	19	04	14	-24	$\underline{01}$
	14	24	-22	15	02	-01	-07	28	(28)	-05	33
Hypothesis 14. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (105).	10	18	$\underline{34}$	$\underline{67}$	$\underline{31}$	10	$\underline{49}$	13	$\underline{54}$	$\underline{34}$	$\underline{03}$
	14	10	$\underline{45}$	15	13	$\underline{36}$	$\underline{35}$	$\underline{39}$	21	22	49
Hypothesis 15. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Persistence (106).	10	-05	$\underline{32}$	06	17	07	$\underline{36}$	(-28)	(26)	24	14
	14	17	12	20	02	12	-01	23	-03	15	95
Hypothesis 16. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Initiation (109).	10	-00	05	-11	-19	-17	-11	$-\underline{41}$	-03	16	65
	14	00	-26	-24	-18	02	-03	-05	-21	06	67
Hypothesis 17. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Implementation (110).	10	22	-09	(-29)	(30)	-19	$\underline{30}$	03	-09	04	(09)
	14	03	-05	$-\underline{33}$	08	-00	-17	-01	-11	-14	76

Note: Underlined correlation coefficients are significant at or below the .05 level.
Correlations shown in parentheses are significant between the .05 and the .10 levels.

[1] The right-hand column shows the probability that true International Differences exist.
Underlined probability figures represent a significance level below .05.
Probability figures in parentheses represent a significance between the .05 and .10 levels.

Correlations With
Achievement (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 18. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (111).	10	16	-32	03	X	-14	-23	16	-05	(30)	05
	14	15	02	(-29)	X	05	-09	23	-05	03	36
Hypothesis 19. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	17	13	-17	-08	(27)	-10	09	39	-14	19
	14	17	-11	-04	19	26	09	40	-12	26	28
Hypothesis 20. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	21	33	-08	04	04	23	08	23	04	43
	14	00	(31)	(-27)	-17	19	07	09	14	11	30
Hypothesis 21. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	10	-03	16	-10	17	-09	12	02	09	-19	68
	14	-03	12	04	-15	09	02	-16	-12	10	90
Hypothesis 22. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Aggression Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	03	-08	-11	05	09	(-27)	15	07	01	71
	14	-21	18	02	-06	-03	06	(28)	01	09	57
Hypothesis 23. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Engagement (102).	10	14	00	20	-25	08	-01	08	04	33	68
	14	09	-09	18	(30)	12	-08	-07	-18	02	67
Hypothesis 24. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Initiation (103).	10	-05	24	39	-24	12	22	(32)	17	-10	17
	14	02	-09	12	(26)	24	02	35	19	21	56
Hypothesis 25. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (105).	10	31	(29)	57	34	11	53	33	58	42	22
	14	33	47	03	35	14	43	14	46	22	05
Hypothesis 26. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Persistence (106).	10	19	34	-05	13	12	16	-13	(28)	08	35
	14	01	24	(27)	06	-15	07	07	-00	36	72
Hypothesis 27. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Initiation(109).	10	23	23	-14	(-27)	-14	-10	(-28)	03	18	20
	14	12	-37	-24	-55	-39	12	06	-17	-01	26
Hypothesis 28. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Implementation (110).	10	06	08	-23	-17	22	10	11	-08	03	79
	14	23	-18	-33	34	-08	-12	03	-06	-12	25
Hypothesis 29. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (111).	10	24	-24	-06	X	18	-22	19	-02	24	14
	14	(27)	-12	-25	X	03	-15	23	05	14	15
Hypothesis 30. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	11	(30)	-17	31	-37	14	-15	38	14	(07)
	14	07	-13	-02	21	-03	21	18	-09	(29)	59
Hypothesis 31. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of IPR Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	04	26	-13	13	-24	09	19	18	01	60
	14	-01	09	-24	16	-01	32	-15	-09	17	17
Hypothesis 32. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	10	22	14	-10	22	25	23	-15	15	-50	00
	14	01	14	-07	00	-16	(29)	38	10	08	47
Hypothesis 33. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Aggression Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	-20	-03	-07	-16	-08	-15	05	05	04	89
	14	02	07	-14	13	-12	02	06	-07	-00	97
Hypothesis 34. There will be a positive relationship between Grade Point Average (4) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Engagement (102).	10	24	11	07	15	26	24	24	08	36	78
	14	21	-03	19	32	32	(31)	16	-18	08	42
Hypothesis 35. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Initiation (103).	10	04	24	21	-02	-00	18	48	13	12	32
	14	39	-05	(30)	05	-02	34	46	09	09	27
Hypothesis 36. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (105).	10	58	47	58	41	39	59	56	65	35	83
	14	32	23	64	35	37	76	64	(26)	13	00

Correlations With Achievement (continued)	Age	Braz	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 37. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Academic Achievement: Persistence (106).	10	35	24	04	06	-08	23	03	13	35	45
	14	(27)	-05	25	-32	06	06	18	11	06	84
Hypothesis 38. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Initiation (109).	10	-08	25	-10	-32	-03	04	-38	15	-05	19
	14	-00	-41	-19	-03	09	18	-01	-09	02	36
Hypothesis 39. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Implementation (110).	10	03	-01	-04	-02	-21	-14	-15	(-27)	05	85
	14	-02	-21	-26	24	10	-03	-12	-02	-13	97
Hypothesis 40: There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (111).	10	-05	-18	06	X	-32	16	01	-01	-02	72
	14	15	-24	-16	X	21	01	(33)	-23	08	15
Hypothesis 41. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	02	01	-13	02	-02	36	07	42	05	35
	14	-00	-13	-02	24	06	-09	19	-06	32	46
Hypothesis 42. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of IPR Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	-00	38	(-27)	(28)	-06	20	06	39	-22	02
	14	10	11	-04	21	-16	09	-01	-13	17	90
Hypothesis 43. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	10	13	33	-13	10	-03	26	-20	31	(-28)	02
	14	00	01	06	-16	08	-01	10	(-28)	09	81
Hypothesis 44. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Aggression Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	01	01	-05	-00	-11	-22	-16	-03	-12	98
	14	-00	(30)	03	-09	34	00	17	08	08	84
Correlations With Coping Effectiveness											
Hypothesis 45a. There will be a positive relationship between Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (5) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	59	X	41	20	10	38	43	39	40	86
	14	46	X	56	28	49	74	70	11	11	00
Hypothesis 45b. There will be a positive relationship between BRS Task Achievement (5) and Mother's Evaluation of Child's Academic Task Achievement (135).	10	35	X	(30)	07	-02	(26)	39	38	32	34
	14	53	X	51	31	(28)	54	60	08	43	11
Hypothesis 46. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	08	02	11	X	04	-03	54	-08	19	16
	14	-08	10	08	X	10	-02	10	-18	06	95
Hypothesis 47. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	31	-11	23	X	-02	09	27	-08	10	45
	14	(27)	-33	-13	X	-02	17	20	16	-12	(08)
Hypothesis 48. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	(-26)	12	-25	X	10	02	(-32)	-42	-10	10
	14	-18	10	-18	X	-33	-14	-44	-38	(-30)	33
Hypothesis 49. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	-05	21	-16	X	(-27)	02	-38	-15	07	19
	14	14	-09	10	X	-18	(-30)	11	(-27)	10	19
Hypothesis 50. There will be a positive relationship between T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (51) (Germany 68) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	43	(-31)	03	-10	-08	02	13	18	12	(08)
	14	(31)	34	14	09	32	-07	46	(-26)	06	03
Hypothesis 51. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany 112) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	19	-24	24	24	-02	-13	17	36	12	16
	14	25	36	15	17	(28)	10	53	-24	17	03
Hypothesis 52. There will be a positive relationship between T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 1 (138) (Germany 129) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	-20	20	-25	36	X	17	-06	14	20	29
	14	25	36	15	17	(28)	10	53	-24	17	03
Hypothesis 53. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany 227) and maternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	10	42	33	05	19	10	(29)	26	31	(27)	86
	14	-10	02	17	23	-07	(28)	41	13	-12	17
Hypothesis 54. There will be a positive relationship between Coping Effectiveness in Nonacademic Achievement as measured by BRS (6) and maternal report of Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness(111).	10	-10	X	-23	X	-20	-09	03	-23	03	91
	14	-01	X	11	X	-15	-05	37	42	-05	11
Hypothesis 55. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal report of Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness (111).	10	-20	10	16	X	08	36	02	02	(27)	24
	14	-16	-06	(29)	X	-05	-11	24	-03	-04	52

Correlations With
Coping Effectiveness (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 56. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal report of Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness (111).	10	-06	-15	37	X	09	(29)	-11	(26)	35	(06)
	14	-17	-16	21	X	17	22	02	02	-21	32
Hypothesis 57. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal report of Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness (111).	10	-08	06	22	X	20	-22	-09	-37	-17	(08)
	14	-13	-02	-13	X	-14	-00	-19	-12	-01	96
Hypothesis 58. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal report of Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness (111).	10	-25	-05	02	X	09	-20	-12	-15	15	57
	14	-20	-07	-02	X	02	-26	-18	-25	00	75
Hypothesis 59. There will be a positive relationship between Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (51) and maternal report (111).	10	11	-01	-11	X	16	07	05	-07	04	92
	14	06	-02	07	X	-12	04	-05	09	24	94
Hypothesis 60. There will be a positive relationship between Total T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) and maternal report of Nonacademic Task Achievement (111).	10	-36	-04	06	X	01	26	-07	21	-10	31
	14	01	-10	-05	X	-12	22	03	-02	-01	94
Hypothesis 61. There will be a positive relationship between Nonacademic Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 6 (142) and maternal report (111).	10	20	-11	07	X	15	01	-07	-20	-23	48
	14	11	39	02	X	-38	-24	28	07	23	05
Hypothesis 62. There will be a positive relationship between Total Nonacademic Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) and maternal report of Nonacademic Coping Effectiveness (111).	10	10	-34	-00	X	-14	-09	-19	12	16	40
	14	04	02	15	X	01	02	13	14	10	99
Hypothesis 63. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (8) (Germany 7) and maternal report (119).	10	04	X	00	-04	-01	15	-01	44	(-27)	03
	14	22	X	06	00	46	01	04	-01	07	42
Hypothesis 64. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal report of IPR - Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	-05	04	-16	X	01	16	02	10	-04	95
	14	13	23	33	X	05	01	17	09	(29)	57
Hypothesis 65. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal report of IPR - Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	32	19	-01	X	02	(27)	04	17	(29)	47
	14	32	14	15	X	-22	08	39	(27)	07	27
Hypothesis 66. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal report of IPR - Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	-35	-07	08	X	20	01	-07	-02	-05	59
	14	-09	-22	05	X	-53	-36	-08	-04	24	12
Hypothesis 67. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal report of IPR - Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	05	-02	04	X	-04	19	-17	21	01	79
	14	-10	06	15	X	-26	-06	(-29)	-06	(-27)	53
Hypothesis 68. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion(57) (Germany 77) and maternal report (119).	10	-12	03	19	12	-17	(-30)	-23	-09	-01	51
	14	04	-01	-01	08	19	12	09	-01	-05	95
Hypothesis 69. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany 112) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	-02	-13	15	09	-13	-14	-20	04	-06	79
	14	21	03	32	-06	25	08	16	-16	-05	33
Hypothesis 70. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 4 (140) (Germany - Story 2 - 143) and maternal report (119).	10	05	-07	-10	25	-15	-06	14	02	40	13
	14	-03	03	17	-20	15	-35	-01	06	02	69
Hypothesis 71. There will be a positive relationship between Interpersonal Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 7 (143) and maternal report (119).	10	-02	11	05	X	26	18	24	05	-05	88
	14	-17	22	12	X	-06	-01	11	08	-08	82
Hypothesis 72. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany 227) and maternal report of Interpersonal Coping Effectiveness (119).	10	14	04	-09	-02	-10	05	33	23	04	65
	14	-16	-03	04	17	-15	-01	17	-05	-23	65
Hypothesis 73. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (9) (Germany 13) and maternal report (125).	10	31	X	23	-07	-10	-24	-11	10	(-26)	(08)
	14	-25	X	15	24	02	-06	-17	(-28)	24	34
Hypothesis 74. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness(125)	10	08	06	23	X	-00	-04	-06	-22	01	86
	14	-23	23	02	X	(30)	-07	-26	02	-20	13

Correlations With Coping Effectiveness (continued)	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 75. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	10	02	-31	10	X	07	06	-14	02	12	59
	14	15	-10	03	X	06	-19	-43	25	03	19
Hypothesis 76. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	10	-20	10	36	X	-10	-11	23	-11	14	18
	14	06	17	-01	X	-18	-13	-03	-03	-22	84
Hypothesis 77. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	10	-02	24	21	X	-08	-06	-21	18	-17	35
	14	-01	-15	-04	X	-14	-13	-09	07	07	95
Hypothesis 78. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (69) (Germany 95) and by maternal report (125).	10	-22	-04	-10	16	13	-15	-05	01	08	84
	14	08	15	-02	-17	58	05	-12	17	-17	(06)
Hypothesis 79. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany 112) and by maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness(125).	10	-05	-21	-14	14	01	-00	-27	-16	-00	92
	14	16	06	04	-13	14	-32	-19	02	(26)	29
Hypothesis 80. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 5 (141) and by maternal report (125).	10	14	16	12	X	06	-07	-20	37	-10	31
	14	-09	16	25	X	-11	18	-18	-18	14	35
Hypothesis 80a. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 4 (Stage III - Var. 171) and by maternal report (125) - GERMANY ONLY.	10				02						
	14				-04						
Hypothesis 80b. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 6 (Stage III - Var. 199) and by maternal report (125) - GERMANY ONLY.	10				04						
	14				-11						
Hypothesis 81. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany 227) and maternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	10	20	00	-14	20	01	-04	-20	(27)	22	33
	14	-17	19	-02	02	-20	-01	-11	-21	09	68
Hypothesis 82. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (7) (Germany 6) and by maternal report (115).	10	13	X	04	-17	04	18	19	(29)	-13	44
	14	11	X	02	(30)	15	-07	10	04	18	96
Hypothesis 83. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	-04	-08	-04	X	-09	26	16	08	20	64
	14	03	-05	16	X	04	15	21	10	14	97
Hypothesis 84. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	03	06	35	X	-13	22	34	-04	15	34
	14	44	-10	-25	X	-10	-15	23	-01	08	(07)
Hypothesis 85. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	25	12	-07	X	-03	-13	-07	16	-06	61
	14	-14	-28	00	X	-01	-20	04	-40	-01	37
Hypothesis 86. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	-02	-02	32	X	02	05	-08	21	24	74
	14	03	03	-02	X	-10	-20	14	-17	-02	85
Hypothesis 87. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (63) (Germany 86) and by maternal report (115).	10	-09	-42	18	-09	07	40	12	(26)	20	(08)
	14	26	-11	06	14	-12	25	(28)	10	17	47
Hypothesis 88. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany 112) and by maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	-19	-33	04	-16	16	21	09	36	25	(08)
	14	21	-02	23	-10	-06	05	23	09	21	80
Hypothesis 89. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 2 (139) and by maternal report (115).	10	15	10	-08	X	-09	32	-07	05	-23	38
	14	04	-23	09	X	-12	04	12	-07	32	30
Hypothesis 90. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 10 (145) and by maternal report (115).	10	17	-24	26	X	-04	09	02	-04	-17	45
	14	-00	-18	-13	X	14	-07	-00	25	01	71

Correlations With
Coping Effectiveness (continued)

	Age	Bras.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 90a. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 5 (Stâge III - 185) and by maternal report (115). GERMANY ONLY.	10				-32						
	14				-32						
Hypothesis 91. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany, 227) and by maternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	10	17	13	15	10	-03	22	-01	08	-10	78
	14	-21	-12	-03	05	-04	13	(32)	11	16	36
Hypothesis 92. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (10) and by maternal report (128).	10	08	X	-15	X	17	-36	05	-18	-06	40
	14	05	X	08	X	21	26	21	-12	-07	58
Hypothesis 93. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (11) and by maternal report (128).	10	03	X	-24	X	38	-15	01	-13	06	42
	14	-06	X	39	X	-12	(31)	-22	13	02	24
Hypothesis 94. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal report of Aggression - Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	-05	(-29)	-15	X	05	-07	-08	-24	-07	68
	14	-00	15	-18	X	03	19	11	-06	-06	68
Hypothesis 95. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal report of Aggression - Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	05	-16	06	X	-03	-10	-15	-03	28	61
	14	15	37	-44	X	10	-08	-05	-05	13	01
Hypothesis 96. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal report of Aggression - Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	16	-06	-08	X	05	-25	03	(-30)	01	32
	14	-19	-18	-11	X	-22	05	-05	(-29)	-17	91
Hypothesis 97. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal report of Aggression - Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	-16	11	35	X	09	05	-14	(-26)	-17	14
	14	08	-01	-16	X	21	03	10	-19	-01	67
Hypothesis 98. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (74) (Germany, 103) and by maternal report (128).	10	00	-02	16	08	01	(-30)	-05	-12	-20	86
	14	04	-18	10	01	09	-09	-07	-14	03	93
Hypothesis 99. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112) and by maternal report of Aggression-Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	-04	-24	07	-04	-03	15	-04	-17	11	76
	14	07	17	-08	-02	38	-06	08	10	25	56
Hypothesis 100. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 8 (144) (Germany, Story 3, 157) and by maternal report (128).	10	-08	20	-04	06	-08	12	14	(28)	02	66
	14	-16	06	-17	17	-13	05	06	24	08	61
Hypothesis 101. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany, 227) and by maternal report of Aggression-Coping Effectiveness (128).	10	-00	15	-01	-19	-11	-08	-16	-05	22	75
	14	12	-20	-23	14	-07	-10	-11	05	08	76
Correlations with Coping Style Measures											
Hypothesis 102. There will be a positive relationship between Academic T.A. Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (Stage I - 50) (Germany, Stage III - 66) and by maternal report in the interview (Stage II - Var. 102).	10	03	-16	-16	-11	03	21	-03	(29)	08	51
	14	07	-24	23	-03	-12	(30)	20	-04	04	28
Hypothesis 103. There will be a positive relationship between Academic T.A. Engagement as measured by Story 1 (89) (Germany, 122) and by maternal report of Academic T.A. - Engagement (102).	10	01	13	25	01	-17	-09	-13	-02	-06	62
	14	-14	-00	01	05	-08	06	25	10	10	83
Hypothesis 104. There will be a positive relationship between Nonacademic T.A. Initiation as measured by Story 6 (115) and by maternal report of Nonacademic Task Achievement - Initiation (109).	10	18	02	-14	X	11	-16	17	-04	-06	76
	14	00	01	03	X	-03	-32	07	03	11	52
Hypothesis 105. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Stance as measured by Sentence Completion (55) (Germany, 74) and by maternal report of IPR Stance (116).	10	00	-21	-03	-09	-06	21	02	01	-19	68
	14	11	05	14	-32	05	14	12	33	16	97
Hypothesis 106. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (56) (Germany, 75) and by maternal report of IPR Engagement (117).	10	-01	X	-09	02	-30	-21	-08	03	09	42
	14	-08	17	-07	(-28)	18	05	11	-08	02	84

Correlations With Coping Style Measures (continued)	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 107. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Engagement as measured by Story 4 (102) and by maternal report (117).	10	-15	X	22	X	17	31	-05	-11	-05	33
	14	-13	31	-08	X	11	14	12	13	03	67
Hypothesis 108. There will be a positive relationship between Positive IPR Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (60) (Germany, 81) and Affect by maternal report (118).	10	-08	X	23	-09	-10	X	X	X	09	61
	14	-14	-13	X	X	02	02	-14	X	X	90
Hypothesis 109. There will be a negative relationship between Negative IPR Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (58) (Germany, Hostile Affect 78) and Affect as measured by maternal report (118).	10	-05	15	-26	-35	23	00	-01	06	11	51
	14	-06	03	33	-08	-01	09	(-32)	-05	-14	15
Hypothesis 110. There will be no significant relationship between Neutral IPR Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (59) (Germany, 80) and Affect as measured by maternal report (118).	10	09	-15	22	24	-22	-00	01	-06	-13	63
	14	09	01	-33	11	-00	-10	34	05	14	13
Hypothesis 111. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Affect about the problem as measured by Story 4 (105) and by maternal report (118).	10	19	-14	-06	X	-14	20	33	-10	00	32
	14	17	06	00	X	20	19	18	-26	-02	51
Hypothesis 112. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Affect about the problem as measured by Story 7 (123) and by maternal report (118).	10	02	-03	05	X	09	07	-11	16	-11	94
	14	25	22	-07	X	32	-22	-09	14	-35	02
Hypothesis 113. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 4 (106) (for Germany Story 2, Outcome Affect (141) and by maternal report (118).	10	13	08	04	16	-14	-15	-10	16	-04	80
	14	-07	-02	-20	-05	-06	-21	07	-22	48	12
Hypothesis 114. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 7 (124) and maternal report (118).	10	-04	10	00	X	-12	21	19	-07	(-29)	30
	14	00	16	(-29)	X	-08	-07	-10	03	-12	66
Hypothesis 115. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Stance as measured by Sentence Completion (67) and by maternal report (121).	10	-33	00	-07	X	12	-05	09	-10	-13	56
	14	18	17	-03	X	44	02	-22	13	-22	16
Hypothesis 116. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (68) (Germany, 93) and by maternal report (122).	10	(-27)	21	-02	19	03	-11	05	-12	-19	59
	14	(30)	33	-04	-21	45	-06	-18	09	-34	01
Hypothesis 117. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Engagement as measured by Story 5 (108) and by maternal report (122).	10	-01	-12	16	X	05	08	-20	14	12	73
	14	-09	20	14	X	-20	08	07	-39	-02	19
Hypothesis 118. There will be a negative relationship between Negative Affect about Anxiety as measured by Sentence Completion (70) (Germany, Hostile - 96) and Affect as measured by maternal report (124).	10	-05	08	-01	-14	-21	01	14	11	01	91
	14	-22	(-28)	06	09	-52	-09	-13	-24	12	13
Hypothesis 119. There will be no significant relationship between Neutral Affect about Anxiety as measured by Sentence Completion (71) (Germany, 98) and Affect as measured by maternal report (124).	10	05	-08	01	-03	21	-01	-14	-11	-01	91
	14	22	(28)	-06	-02	53	09	13	24	-12	13
Hypothesis 120. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the problem as measured by Story 5 (111) and by maternal report of Anxiety - Affect (124).	10	09	(-31)	16	X	-19	10	-04	17	11	30
	14	-03	-19	-05	X	-06	12	03	-15	-13	95
Hypothesis 121. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 5 (112) and by maternal report of Anxiety - Affect (124).	10	-07	-04	-42	X	09	11	08	15	(31)	57
	14	26	13	X	X	-17	06	-27	13	00	34
Hypothesis 121a. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 4 (Stage III - Var. 169) and by maternal report of Anxiety - Affect (124). GERMANY ONLY.	10				-12						
	14				-01						
Hypothesis 121b. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 6 (Stage III - Var. 197) and maternal report of Anxiety - Affect (124). GERMANY ONLY.	10				-15						
	14				08						
Hypothesis 122. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (62) (Germany, 84) and by maternal report (113).	10	-01	-08	-14	-04	-11	01	(32)	-06	21	56
	14	15	(28)	13	12	01	02	-05	-03	-20	58

Correlations With Coping Style Measures (continued)	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 123. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Engagement as measured by Story 2 (97) and by maternal report (113).	10	-05	32	-03	X	-03	02	-15	(29)	-09	32
	14	-11	-05	-14	X	12	-11	-09	-33	-02	58
Hypothesis 124. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Engagement as measured by Story 10 (132) and by maternal report (113).	10	-06	-13	15	X	-08	12	-39	-06	02	44
	14	-21	21	07	X	10	(27)	-02	02	01	58
Hypothesis 125. There will be a negative relationship between Negative Affect about Authority as measured by Sentence Completion (64) (Germany, Hostile - 87) and Affect as measured by maternal report (114).	10	05	33	-14	06	-02	-25	08	-02	-37	16
	14	-10	08	01	-13	19	-09	-56	01	-16	10
Hypothesis 126. There will be no significant relationship between Neutral Affect about Authority as measured by Sentence Completion (65) (Germany, 89) and Affect as measured by maternal report (114).	10	-08	-33	13	-16	11	17	-12	02	(29)	24
	14	15	-08	-03	18	-19	08	56	-01	21	10
Hypothesis 127. There will be a positive relationship between Positive Affect about Authority as measured by Sentence Completion (66) and Affect as measured by maternal report (114).	10	15	X	-03	X	-35	24	(30)	X	14	(08)
	14	-16	X	10	X	X	01	X	X	-24	56
Hypothesis 128. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the problem as measured by Story 2 (99) and by maternal report of Authority-Affect (114).	10	-04	-27	22	X	-21	-04	05	02	14	77
	14	-01	11	-18	X	17	19	04	13	05	89
Hypothesis 129. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the problem as measured by Story 10 (135) and by maternal report of Authority-Affect (114).	10	-24	-24	-06	X	-26	-12	06	07	12	55
	14	-05	-08	-13	X	-19	17	02	(-30)	09	49
Hypothesis 130. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 2 (100) and by maternal report of Authority-Affect (114).	10	-11	-02	-12	X	03	10	-20	-07	-20	93
	14	25	(-30)	02	X	(-30)	10	16	08	05	17
Hypothesis 131. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 10 (136) and by maternal report of Authority-Affect (114).	10	03	14	-14	X	-21	X	27	-18	-18	30
	14	11	12	-13	X	-15	16	04	-05	07	92
Hypothesis 131a. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 5 (Stage III - Var. 183) and by maternal report of Authority-Affect (114). GERMANY ONLY.	10				-21						
	14				-39						
Hypothesis 132. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (73) and by maternal report(126).	10	-12	14	-10	X	-19	04	-13	-10	01	94
	14	-01	21	08	X	-01	04	-01	-34	-15	55
Hypothesis 133. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Engagement as measured by Story 8 (126) and by maternal report (126).	10	-21	-07	03	X	(-29)	-01	-17	21	(28)	(09)
	14	-14	06	-10	X	(30)	26	04	20	-02	40
Hypothesis 134. There will be a negative relationship between Negative Affect about Aggression as measured by Sentence Completion (75) and Affect as measured by maternal report (127) (Germany, 104).	10	-16	05	-12	23	05	04	13	12	18	81
	14	09	-10	-19	-02	-02	06	21	11	-16	64
Hypothesis 135. There will be no significant relationship between Neutral Affect about Aggression as measured by Sentence Completion (76) (Germany, 106) and Affect as measured by maternal report (127).	10	16	-05	12	-09	-05	-04	-13	-12	-18	81
	14	-09	10	19	02	02	-06	-21	-11	16	64
Hypothesis 136. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the problem as measured by Story 8 (129) and Affect as measured by maternal report of Aggression - Affect (127).	10	09	-18	(-30)	X	17	-07	28	-08	-09	25
	14	-12	-19	-14	X	-17	17	-03	-10	36	14
Hypothesis 137. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 8 (130) and by maternal report of Aggression - Affect (127).	10	-10	-09	X	X	-23	(31)	-04	(29)	35	03
	14	-09	X	02	X	-26	-23	-03	(-27)	12	43

style on the Social Attitudes Inventory and the maternal ratings of Coping Effectiveness, particularly in the Task Achievement areas. This was by no means true in all countries but it appeared in enough places to be more than a chance occurrence.

The Sentence Completion score for Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement area correlated significantly with mother reports of Academic Achievement at both ages in Brazil, and at fourteen in Mexico, Italy, Chicago, and Austin, as well. The total Coping Effectiveness score on the Sentence Completion correlated positively and significantly with mother rating of Academic Achievement at age ten in Brazil, Mexico, Yugoslavia, Austin, and Japan;and at age fourteen in Yugoslavia and Chicago.

Similarly, the total Coping Effectiveness score for the Story Completion instrument correlated significantly with mother rating of Academic Achievement at age ten in Brazil, Mexico, Yugoslavia, Austin, and Japan; and at fourteen in Yugoslavia and Chicago.

In summary, there was a rather consistent pattern of agreement between self-report, maternal report, and peer report when it came to overall estimates of a child's effectiveness in dealing with academic tasks. In none of the other areas of behavior, however, did mother ratings agree substantially either with self-report measures or with ratings by the children's classmates.

MOTHERS' REPORTS OF CHILD REARING PRACTICES RELATED TO CHILD BEHAVIOR

In general, as Table 2 illustrates, except for a frequently significant relationship between the mother's expressed satisfaction with her child's academic achievement and the child's real achievement (Hypotheses 151, 161, and 171), the mothers' reports of their own child-rearing practices bore extremely little relationship to the measures of actual child behavior. The number of correlations in Table 2 that exceeded even the generous criterion of a ten percent level of probability did not exceed chance, except possibly in England and Mexico.

There were very few relationships which reached significance in as many as three or more countries. In Mexico and Germany, there was a negative relationship between the child's GPA and the amount of encouragement in schoolwork given by the mother. In Austin, this relationship was significant but positive. Mothers' guidance of non-academic achievement was positively related to GPA in Japan and almost reached a significant correlation in Italy and Yugoslavia. This was true only at age ten. Maternal encouragement of the child to deal with his own anxiety was positively related to GPA in Italy and Japan but negatively related to GPA in Brazil and Mexico, for the fourteen-year-olds. This kind of training for independence in the handling of anxiety seems to have a positive effect on school performance in Italy and Japan but a negative effect in Brazil and Mexico.

Another significant international difference was found for Hypothesis 186. In Mexico, when the mother encouraged the child to do his own schoolwork, this was positively related to total Coping Effectiveness as measured by the Story Completion; whereas in Chicago the relationship of these two variables was a negative one. The data for Hypothesis 189 on the ten-year-olds showed a positive correlation between maternal initiative in contacting the child's teachers and the child's Passive Coping score on the Social Attitudes Inventory in Brazil and Yugoslavia; whereas in Mexico the relationship was a negative one.

The data for Hypothesis 193, at both ages, showed a significant relationship in some countries between the amount of teacher contact reported by the mother and total Coping Effectiveness as measured by the Sentence Completion. At ten years, this relationship was positive in Chicago but negative in Austin. At fourteen years it was negative in Brazil, Mexico, and Japan. This offers a hint that, in the latter three countries at least, the fourteen-year-old's effectiveness in coping on his own is understandably better if his mother leaves his school performance to his own initiative rather than maintaining a close surveillance through contacts with his teachers.

Hypothesis 197 demonstrated a positive relationship between the Active Coping score and the SAI and the degree to which the mother reported helping the child with his homework, in Brazil; in Chicago and Austin, on the other hand, such active intervention was negatively related to the child's self-report of Active Coping. The evidence for Hypothesis 199 showed a negative relationship between such help with homework and the Active Defensive score in the SAI in Yugoslavia, while there was a significant positive relationship in Mexico; both of these occurred at age ten, only. In this respect, as in several of the relationships reported above, the children of Mexico City did not appear to demonstrate the dependence and passivity which have been found in earlier studies of Mexican folk societies.

The evidence on Hypothesis 201 at age fourteen showed a significant negative relationship between help with homework and the Sentence Completion measure of Academic Coping Effectiveness, in Mexico, Chicago, and Japan. In these three sites fourteen-year-olds whose mothers leave them to their own devices, report that they handle academic tasks more effectively.

Hypothesis 210 showed the largest number of significant correlations, although in opposite directions in different countries. Among ten-year-olds, maternal directiveness was positively correlated with the Sentence Completion score for total Coping Effectiveness in Germany and Italy but negatively correlated in Mexico. At fourteen, significant negative correlations appeared in England and Italy but a positive correlation appeared in Yugoslavia. These international differences were significant beyond the .02 level. The effect of strong maternal directiveness changed with increasing age and it also varied in its effects from one country to another.

Table 2

Mothers' Reports of Their Child-Rearing Practices Correlated with Actual Children's Achievement and Coping Scores

Correlations with Achievement

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 138. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and the level of activity reported by mother (131).	10	-03	11	09	03	-13	-05	06	-19	35	32
	14	17	18	-08	11	05	-10	-05	03	04	84
Hypothesis 139. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and the amount of teacher contact reported by the mother (133).	10	19	-31	14	X	-23	-06	03	-06	06	41
	14	14	-14	(29)	X	15	-07	12	10	-15	43
Hypothesis 140. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134).	10	14	-19	-05	-01	-35	03	17	-07	-02	57
	14	13	19	10	12	11	-03	20	-02	-08	89
Hypothesis 141. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and mother's evaluation of child's Academic Achievement (135).	10	00	01	44	-04	19	22	06	03	21	20
	14	15	08	01	13	22	(29)	08	38	13	74
Hypothesis 142. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136).	10	19	-10	-19	-12	12	(-27)	22	17	-24	(10)
	14	-12	-26	16	-00	-08	19	10	-19	-19	32
Hypothesis 143. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report: Nonacademic Achievement Directiveness (142).	10	-05	-24	-09	19	14	-05	07	-23	-18	71
	14	-19	-16	-44	18	-03	01	-08	14	14	(09)
Hypothesis 144. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Constructive Guidance of Nonacademic Achievement (143).	10	30	11	-03	-11	01	22	-17	13	(27)	55
	14	01	05	-16	-11	02	01	00	02	14	97
Hypothesis 145. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Child's Growth vs Mother's Convenience (144).	10	-21	-12	-23	X	-18	-15	21	07	00	44
	14	12	01	-20	X	10	-20	(29)	00	-13	35
Hypothesis 146. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Degree of Constructiveness for (Child's) IPR (152).	10	24	10	24	X	00	08	-16	05	-14	44
	14	-16	-02	07	X	-11	-18	-04	-06	16	86
Hypothesis 147. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Anxiety: Degree of maternal encouragement of child to deal with his own Anxiety (154).	10	(27)	11	15	11	-05	-06	-03	-06	-35	18
	14	-21	-08	-06	14	-04	-12	-34	00	14	62
Hypothesis 148. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and the level of activity reported by mother (131).	10	-03	12	18	11	-01	34	04	15	(30)	25
	14	03	20	-06	-01	-00	-02	-00	05	09	96
Hypothesis 149. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and the amount of teacher contact reported by mother (133).	10	16	-05	20	X	-16	20	03	17	17	45
	14	-08	-14	20	X	11	-11	26	25	07	29
Hypothesis 150. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134).	10	03	-25	-15	-09	-00	01	21	(28)	(-28)	22
	14	19	-03	17	-22	-12	-17	-16	09	07	58
Hypothesis 151. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and mother's evaluation of child's Academic Achievement (135).	10	-06	17	55	(28)	11	50	-01	49	(27)	01
	14	14	22	12	04	23	40	36	40	40	70
Hypothesis 152. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and the amount of help with homework reported by mother(136).	10	21	04	-25	03	04	-08	07	18	-19	35
	14	11	-10	11	-05	-05	21	(-28)	-21	11	29
Hypothesis 153. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement Directiveness (142).	10	-10	(-28)	-08	20	04	-17	17	-33	-03	65
	14	03	-22	-33	16	19	-08	22	19	-02	(08)
Hypothesis 154. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Constructive Guidance of Nonacademic Achievement (143).	10	15	26	-09	-24	-12	23	-01	15	15	56
	14	11	14	-21	07	-09	16	11	05	(30)	53

Correlations with Achievement (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P <
Hypothesis 155. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Child's Growth vs Mother's Convenience (144).	10	07	-07	-23	X	-14	21	-07	02	-03	56
	14	01	-11	(-27)	X	07	-14	-08	06	-11	84
Hypothesis 156. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Degree of Constructiveness for (Child's) IPR (152).	10	-02	05	18	X	03	09	-06	-02	08	96
	14	08	16	36	X	-05	-19	02	-07	24	16
Hypothesis 157. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Anxiety: Degree of maternal encouragement of Child to deal with his own anxiety (154).	10	04	-06	23	-19	-06	03	10	31	07	78
	14	-17	-37	11	-06	03	-08	07	-02	13	34
Hypothesis 158. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and the level of activity reported by mother (131).	10	11	16	24	(27)	12	(29)	-03	11	21	52
	14	12	03	-06	02	-02	09	07	05	16	98
Hypothesis 159. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and the amount of teacher contact reported by mother (133).	10	-20	-04	21	X	04	-12	07	26	22	19
	14	-19	-09	16	X	37	-25	-08	23	01	24
Hypothesis 160. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134).	10	-05	(-28)	-06	(-26)	-06	07	18	21	-06	46
	14	20	-03	15	15	(28)	-39	24	23	-02	(07)
Hypothesis 161. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and mother's evaluation of child's Academic Achievement (135).	10	24	18	58	(27)	10	48	(29)	55	16	(06)
	14	18	38	02	37	17	25	04	37	21	53
Hypothesis 162. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136).	10	13	-03	-19	-05	07	08	-16	30	-01	42
	14	-04	-20	13	-23	08	08	-09	-26	23	32
Hypothesis 163. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement Directiveness (142).	10	01	-25	-15	-07	08	-20	08	-31	-11	56
	14	-26	-23	(-29)	22	-09	-48	(30)	22	01	00
Hypothesis 164. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Constructive Guidance of Nonacademic Achievement (143).	10	03	13	-15	10	(27)	08	-16	05	25	66
	14	-07	05	-20	09	14	01	25	08	15	60
Hypothesis 165. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Child's Growth vs Mother's Convenience (144).	10	12	-18	-15	X	20	(27)	11	20	01	35
	14	16	-22	-24	X	01	-18	11	02	-08	47
Hypothesis 166. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Degree of Constructiveness for (Child's) IPR (152).	10	22	15	11	X	-10	17	-15	05	03	78
	14	-05	22	(28)	X	10	-01	14	14	-18	31
Hypothesis 167. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Anxiety: Degree of maternal encouragement of Child to deal with his own anxiety (154).	10	32	05	18	11	-13	-06	-12	05	-09	39
	14	-00	-45	12	11	06	00	-16	-12	14	18
Hypothesis 168. There will be a positive relationship between Grade Point Average (4) and the level of activity reported by mother (131).	10	24	09	14	-08	01	(29)	08	-05	(30)	59
	14	10	14	13	-17	18	14	-12	09	18	85
Hypothesis 169. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and the amount of teacher contact reported by the mother (133).	10	-04	04	15	X	06	02	16	23	01	94
	14	22	-00	-00	X	22	-23	21	18	02	43
Hypothesis 170. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134).	10	-13	-31	00	-35	-10	-21	08	31	04	22
	14	-09	-17	-08	-10	08	(-29)	-10	09	-00	71
Hypothesis 171. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and mother's evaluation of child's Academic Achievement (135).	10	49	33	52	43	23	31	45	58	(28)	69
	14	47	(32)	61	(26)	11	55	57	40	33	04
Hypothesis 172. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136).	10	-19	(-30)	-19	14	-02	-12	-35	09	04	36
	14	-21	-27	-23	-12	(30)	-15	(-31)	-08	12	43
Hypothesis 173. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement Directiveness (142).	10	-03	-15	-05	07	20	03	02	-10	12	83
	14	-16	-26	-08	04	24	-26	22	32	02	(07)

Correlations with Achievement (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 174. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Constructive Guidance of Nonacademic Achievement(143).	10	12	11	-09	-22	(26)	(27)	-01	15	33	68
	14	-16	-22	02	22	-07	18	22	12	17	32
Hypothesis 175. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Non-academic Achievement: Child's Growth vs Mother's Convenience (144).	10	-02	-25	-11	X	-15	35	07	32	-07	15
	14	15	-35	-20	X	21	-08	03	19	-10	31
Hypothesis 176. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Degree of Constructiveness for (Child's) IPR (152).	10	-23	-17	08	X	09	06	01	02	-04	82
	14	-01	26	31	X	23	-14	-02	-03	04	54
Hypothesis 177. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Anxiety: Degree of maternal encouragement of Child to deal with his own anxiety (154).	10	22	(29)	18	06	21	04	-04	-12	-15	29
	14	(-30)	-36	00	-11	38	13	-00	-20	(28)	03

Correlations with Coping Effectiveness

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 178. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as assessed by BRS (5).	10	-03	X	-17	-08	-10	-20	-02	-00	-11	93
	14	15	X	-36	(-27)	-05	-20	-20	08	03	30
Hypothesis 179. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal report of Task Achievement - Implementation (134).	10	-05	09	25	X	13	-08	15	-11	04	82
	14	20	-04	-16	X	-16	07	00	-26	(-28)	55
Hypothesis 180. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal report of Task Achievement - Implementation (134).	10	02	-04	-12	X	-10	10	-22	-17	-06	96
	14	-06	-22	-05	X	36	06	-21	03	04	21
Hypothesis 181. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal report of Task Achievement - Implementation (134).	10	-24	04	-11	X	15	16	(-29)	08	-05	28
	14	-05	09	25	X	01	11	09	23	05	75
Hypothesis 182. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal report of Task Achievement - Implementation (134).	10	-14	-03	07	X	-05	13	-28	-09	-11	86
	14	-08	(-28)	-10	X	-21	13	00	09	-09	69
Hypothesis 183. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (51)(Germany, 68).	10	09	13	-33	03	-08	31	-00	19	06	27
	14	02	-06	19	03	-12	09	-34	-12	-18	49
Hypothesis 184. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112).	10	12	11	-38	-09	-06	08	00	19	-01	35
	14	-04	-01	10	14	-09	11	-18	-08	-26	82
Hypothesis 185. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 1 (138) (Germany, 129).	10	-06	(32)	(30)	03	-03	-20	-06	-02	-08	44
	14	-32	02	-26	-15	05	-01	-26	10	02	29
Hypothesis 186. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of encouragement in schoolwork reported by mother (134) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany, 227).	10	13	02	12	-14	-22	-05	01	21	03	66
	14	-17	44	-18	-14	17	07	-39	-09	-01	05
Hypothesis 187. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of teacher contact reported by mother (133) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as assessed by BRS (5).	10	-17	X	36	X	06	-18	(29)	09	22	11
	14	04	X	-21	X	02	-16	(29)	05	22	36
Hypothesis 188. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal report of Task Achievement - Initiation (133).	10	23	-08	-12	X	00	25	-05	-09	-04	62
	14	04	-10	-03	X	10	02	03	-25	-06	96
Hypothesis 189. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal report of Task Achievement - Initiation (133).	10	33	(-31)	-12	X	-03	(27)	08	13	-19	05
	14	-10	19	-17	X	26	-21	23	-18	17	14

Correlations with
Coping Effectiveness (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Austin	Japan	IND P <
Hypothesis 190. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal report of Task Achievement - Initiation (133).	10	-07	-06	-17	X	00	03	-21	19	-02	67
	14	03	-05	16	X	10	-03	-06	-36	20	28
Hypothesis 191. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal report of Task Achievement - Initiation (133).	10	-15	04	-14	X	-04	23	-09	10	15	59
	14	04	20	12	X	-13	03	-06	-30	32	19
Hypothesis 192. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of teacher contact reported by mother (133) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Complition (51) (Germany, 68).	10	14	-02	19	X	-43	07	22	-11	-16	03
	14	-10	-18	08	X	16	33	-04	00	-12	31
Hypothesis 193. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of teacher contact reported by mother (133) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112).	10	-16	09	19	X	-12	08	39	-31	-13	04
	14	-31	-38	-15	X	01	25	11	04	(-29)	12
Hypothesis 194. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of teacher contact reported by mother (133) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 1 (138) (Germany, 129).	10	-01	02	-39	X	18	10	-02	-11	04	39
	14	-22	07	-04	X	08	19	08	-00	-19	68
Hypothesis 195. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of teacher contact reported by mother (133) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany 227).	10	-15	-00	19	X	-14	23	46	-11	-19	(08)
	14	-12	-00	-00	X	26	08	01	-04	(-28)	48
Hypothesis 196. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as assessed by BRS (5).	10	-14	X	-15	(29)	03	-03	-13	-09	06	95
	14	-08	X	-23	-31	-01	-04	-22	-01	18	72
Hypothesis 197. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136).	10	11	-04	-00	X	22	-22	01	10	03	78
	14	(30)	01	-03	X	(-29)	04	-33	-37	00	26
Hypothesis 198. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136).	10	-12	-07	-18	X	22	-20	-16	-00	07	46
	14	-15	-18	01	X	31	14	10	14	25	32
Hypothesis 199. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136).	10	-13	32	23	X	06	-39	11	-20	03	01
	14	11	-01	03	X	21	-07	09	21	-02	95
Hypothesis 200. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and amount of help with homework reported by mother (136).	10	-07	10	07	X	13	-43	04	(-26)	[illegible]	(06)
	14	-17	11	-05	X	-16	-05	-09	31	[illegible]	28
Hypothesis 201. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (51) (Germany, 68).	10	-14	09	-13	14	(-28)	-16	-14	10	-08	59
	14	10	-32	14	-20	15	-08	-34	18	(-27)	15
Hypothesis 202. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112).	10	03	-01	-32	10	-22	09	-04	12	11	40
	14	15	-17	-00	-01	03	03	02	21	-11	81
Hypothesis 203. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136) and Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 1 (138) (Germany, 129).	10	27	15	(-28)	-01	-08	25	-06	-20	06	17
	14	-01	-11	-03	35	-02	-17	04	-32	(30)	30
Hypothesis 204. There will be a positive relationship between the amount of help with homework reported by mother (136) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany, 227)	10	(28)	-13	-06	05	-05	-01	-18	-06	-12	57
	14	-03	02	-03	05	-01	16	-11	-41	13	27
Hypothesis 205. There will be a negative relationship between strength of maternal directiveness as measured by maternal report (142) and Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as assessed by BRS (6).	10	05	X	08	02	37	-07	-05	12	26	32
	14	-20	X	09	-10	08	(-29)	07	03	-17	43
Hypothesis 206. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and Nonacademic T.A. Strength of Maternal Directiveness(142).	10	01	-23	12	X	38	-16	26	19	06	(07)
	14	22	11	-10	X	-06	15	-00	17	19	89

Correlations with
Coping Effectiveness (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 207. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and Nonacademic T.A. Strength of Maternal Directiveness (142).	10	01	01	05	X	32	-05	13	02	-21	36
	14	07	13	-21	X	-18	19	(-32)	05	-16	24
Hypothesis 208. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and Nonacademic T.A. Strength of Maternal Directiveness (142).	10	10	07	02	X	-18	-06	43	19	23	30
	14	07	-18	14	X	19	14	00	-38	-02	17
Hypothesis 209. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and Nonacademic T.A. Strength of Maternal Directiveness (142).	10	07	08	-00	X	-00	-12	-15	02	-10	97
	14	-16	-00	-11	X	03	03	27	17	-05	67
Hypothesis 210. There will be a positive relationship between Strength of Maternal Directiveness as measured by maternal report (142) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112).	10	10	-46	-17	35	35	03	-03	-18	08	02
	14	-05	07	-43	-08	-39	35	12	17	02	01
Hypothesis 211. There will be a negative relationship between Strength of Maternal Directiveness as measured by maternal report (142) and Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 6 (142).	10	-07	-23	05	X	-10	-01	22	11	37	11
	14	-23	03	-10	X	08	-03	-11	-25	04	85
Hypothesis 212. There will be a negative relationship between Strength of Maternal Directiveness as measured by maternal report (142) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany, 227).	10	02	01	14	06	(28)	02	-07	-08	25	51
	14	11	-10	-38	-21	-21	12	-10	-03	-05	41
Hypothesis 213. There will be a positive relationship between degree of constructive guidance reported by mother (143) and Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as assessed by BRS (6).	10	-08	X	-16	X	19	19	(-31)	20	21	13
	14	05	X	04	X	00	07	-00	(29)	00	90
Hypothesis 214. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and degree of constructive guidance reported by mother (143).	10	35	25	-15	X	06	-18	17	-09	12	21
	14	-18	18	-06	X	09	(31)	02	-03	26	20
Hypothesis 215. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and degree of constructive guidance reported by mother (143).	10	07	14	11	X	04	-19	25	-09	-03	74
	14	15	-10	33	X	15	-06	01	15	05	46
Hypothesis 216. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and degree of constructive guidance reported by mother (143).	10	11	04	-05	X	-10	-08	11	03	-13	95
	14	-07	-21	-02	X	-16	-34	-48	-03	-07	22
Hypothesis 217. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and degree of constructive guidance reported by mother (143).	10	05	12	-04	X	-24	-13	05	-11	-14	75
	14	01	-11	13	X	-05	-17	-08	-17	-07	93
Hypothesis 218. There will be a positive relationship between degree of constructive guidance reported by mother (143) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112).	10	01	16	-13	-18	-02	-20	(-29)	23	05	28
	14	21	(-30)	08	-23	31	22	23	-22	23	(07)
Hypothesis 219. There will be a positive relationship between degree of constructive guidance reported by mother (143) and Nonacademic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 6 (142).	10	-18	16	13	X	(-29)	05	-26	10	-04	36
	14	-01	09	-04	X	04	-16	-17	17	09	77
Hypothesis 220. There will be a positive relationship between degree of constructive guidance reported by mother (143) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146). (Germany, 227).	10	03	(30)	08	-01	09	-20	-11	-07	-22	41
	14	21	27	(28)	-12	16	-04	07	13	(30)	82
Hypothesis 221. There will be a positive relationship between amount of guidance reported by mother (152) and IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (8) (Germany, 7).	10	(-28)	X	(27)	X	-05	02	17	-19	05	35
	14	10	X	09	X	02	-11	04	00	03	98
Hypothesis 222. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and amount of guidance reported by mother (152).	10	11	04	07	X	-05	33	-01	13	40	50
	14	01	(29)	04	X	03	-18	06	-20	-09	29
Hypothesis 223. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive-Coping (42) and amount of guidance reported by mother (152).	10	02	18	-10	X	-07	20	01	-01	(29)	63
	14	-22	27	(-28)	X	21	08	-06	-13	(-27)	(06)

Correlations with
Coping Effectiveness (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 224. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and amount of guidance reported by mother (152).	10	09	00	07	X	16	04	-03	02	-33	89
	14	08	-10	07	X	26	17	(29)	-02	-13	47
Hypothesis 225. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and amount of guidance reported by mother (152).	10	07	-00	-07	X	-01	-04	13	08	-03	99
	14	-14	20	-15	X	03	02	-03	08	-05	87
Hypothesis 226. There will be a positive relationship between amount of guidance reported by mother in Interpersonal Relation problems (152) and Interpersonal Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (57) (Germany, 77).	10	-12	24	-18	X	-06	-20	-04	-26	-10	52
	14	37	-05	05	X	-21	-18	14	-17	11	15
Hypothesis 227. There will be a positive relationship between amount of guidance reported by mother in Interpersonal Relation problems (152) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112).	10	(-26)	(29)	-33	X	-10	-01	-18	(-27)	-01	17
	14	18	17	-09	X	10	-14	08	10	18	85
Hypothesis 228. There will be a positive relationship between amount of guidance reported by mother in Interpersonal Relation problems (152) and Interpersonal Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 4 (140) (Germany, Story 2 - 143).	10	19	(-30)	-19	X	13	-07	-04	-06	-07	54
	14	03	15	-09	X	-24	24	20	14	(29)	27
Hypothesis 229. There will be a positive relationship between amount of guidance in Interpersonal Relation problems reported by mother (152) and Interpersonal Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 7 (143).	10	-08	-08	09	X	03	-06	-00	-04	24	91
	14	18	13	04	X	-17	-10	14	07	13	80
Hypothesis 230. There will be a positive relationship between amount of guidance in Interpersonal Relation problems reported by mother (152) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146). (Germany, 227).	10	-04	-11	-09	X	01	22	-09	-03	-08	88
	14	22	13	-20	X	03	-10	-09	18	21	46
Hypothesis 231. There will be a positive relationship between amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154) and Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (9) (Germany, 10).	10	10	X	08	-14	-01	-05	-19	01	-00	94
	14	-05	X	02	-06	46	(28)	10	13	02	02
Hypothesis 232. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154).	10	11	00	-07	X	03	-06	-09	03	23	91
	14	09	-07	30	X	-05	-19	00	03	-05	53
Hypothesis 233. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154).	10	15	-11	14	X	-01	03	11	19	02	94
	14	12	-24	(-28)	X	21	-01	-15	-10	12	18
Hypothesis 234. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154).	10	-19	05	12	X	19	07	-27	-16	-10	45
	14	08	14	16	X	03	-05	-11	07	-20	76
Hypothesis 235. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154).	10	-09	13	-20	X	-05	-07	(32)	-21	-16	38
	14	-04	09	03	X	-11	-15	-11	(29)	12	53
Hypothesis 236. There will be a positive relationship between degree of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154) and Anxiety Coping Efffectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (69) (Germany, 95).	10	-09	07	04	05	13	(28)	-05	19	02	60
	14	-02	-20	03	-02	-01	20	07	-11	-01	92
Hypothesis 237. There will be a positive relationship between degree of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79). (Germany, 112).	10	-22	-03	17	21	18	23	17	07	02	58
	14	(28)	-32	02	06	-07	11	35	-09	05	14
Hypothesis 238. There will be a positive relationship between amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154) and Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 5 (141).	10	16	-34	13	X	-14	-06	15	00	-09	32
	14	17	-04	16	X	-09	-05	01	-19	02	82
Hypothesis 238a. There will be a positive relationship between amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154) and Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 4 (Stage III - 171). Germany Only.	10				00						
	14				-02						

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P
Hypothesis 238b. There will be a positive relationship between amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154) and Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 6 (Stage III - 199). GERMANY ONLY.	10				20						
	14				09						
Hypothesis 239. There will be a positive relationship between amount of encouragement about Anxiety reported by mother (154) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany, 227).	10	17	-11	-06	04	17	-03	16	-07	05	89
	14	-16	-10	-02	25	-17	-07	-12	-45	(-28)	69

On the other hand, Hypothesis 222 showed a positive correlation in Yugoslavia and Japan between the amount of guidance reported by mother and the Active Coping score on the SAI, suggesting that amount of guidance is not necessarily the same as the directiveness with which the guidance is given.

Hypothesis 227 showed a negative relationship at age ten in Brazil, England, and Austin, between amount of maternal guidance in Interpersonal Relations and the total Coping Effectiveness score in the Sentence Completion. In these three countries, a high degree of maternal guidance appears to work against the development of independent coping skills. In Mexico, on the other hand, the relationship between maternal guidance and the Coping Effectiveness score was positive.

The evidence bearing on Hypothesis 237 showed a positive relationship in Brazil and Chicago between maternal encouragement when the child becomes anxious and the child's total Coping Effectiveness score in the Sentence Completion. In Mexico, on the other hand, this relationship was a negative one. These relationships approached significance only at the fourteen-year-old level.

Interpretation of these extremely scattered, sparse relationships carries very little weight, in any case. Out of 202 tests of the 101 hypotheses, relationships which reached significance at the ten percent level appeared in no more than twenty-six of the two hundred and two tests in England, twenty-four in Mexico, twenty-three in Chicago, twenty-two in Japan and Yugoslavia, twenty in Austin and Italy, fourteen in Brazil, and an extremely low eight in Germany. These instances of significant correlations scarcely exceed the chance level for Table 2 as a whole.

Consequently, the most important finding from this part of the study is that even intensive, careful interviewing by well trained, reliable interviewers did not obtain a picture of maternal child rearing which related in any substantial way to the actual behavior patterns demonstrated by the children, in any of these national samples. Taken together with the evidence in Table 1, the results almost overwhelmingly suggest that mothers simply are not reliable reporters either of their children's behavior or of their own child rearing behavior, as it might explain their children's coping behavior.

MOTHERS' COPING STYLES IN RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD COPING BEHAVIOR

Essentially the same lack of reliability and validity of maternal reports is suggested by the data in Table 3. With only a few minor exceptions, this table demonstrates that maternal reports of their own coping behavior bore extremely little relationship to the coping behavior of their children. Indeed, where significant correlations do appear, they are sometimes contrary to the hypothesized relationships. For

Table 3

Mothers' Reports of Their Personal Coping Styles Correlated with Their Children's Achievement and Coping Scores

Correlations with Achievement	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 240. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Implementation (139).	10	14	(-28)	-14	X	03	14	-10	-14	03	53
	14	-15	-35	03	X	01	21	12	-10	-22	24
Hypothesis 241. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Attitude Toward Nonacademic Task Achievement (146).	10	-07	-16	-09	-04	02	32	-08	06	05	60
	14	-10	-10	(-29)	-07	02	03	09	-21	(-28)	72
Hypothesis 242. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Authority: Task Achievement Orientation in Authority Relations (147).	10	-05	-20	-12	-00	-09	11	-16	05	-04	85
	14	-02	05	-30	-03	-01	04	-16	-22	-22	68
Hypothesis 243. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Coping Effectiveness(151).	10	31	09	03	07	10	33	-04	-02	-01	69
	14	-07	27	(28)	02	21	18	37	-01	06	43
Hypothesis 244. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Aggression: Coping Effectiveness (158).	10	-13	-26	06	X	-02	-07	09	04	-09	81
	14	-23	-04	07	X	-11	04	-12	11	00	79
Hypothesis 245. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and maternal report of Locus of Control (159).	10	-16	35	-05	-06	-06	08	(-30)	-08	-14	24
	14	38	08	07	01	-02	47	18	31	26	15
Hypothesis 246. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Implementation (139).	10	07	-11	-08	X	-00	-02	10	-31	-02	95
	14	-02	-25	00	X	05	(28)	-01	-11	-31	28
Hypothesis 247. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Attitude Toward Nonacademic Task Achievement (146).	10	-02	-21	-32	04	14	35	01	-23	01	05
	14	-03	-01	(-26)	-40	07	-06	-03	-31	-18	76
Hypothesis 248. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Authority: Task Achievement Orientation in Authority Relations (147).	10	-11	-21	-21	-05	01	18	-08	-23	-07	56
	14	01	09	-41	-26	-08	09	09	-33	(-26)	12
Hypothesis 249. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Coping Effectiveness (151).	10	21	04	02	-15	-03	47	14	15	-05	37
	14	26	20	08	22	02	12	-13	-21	04	45
Hypothesis 250. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Aggression: Coping Effectiveness (158).	10	-12	-17	-05	X	17	-17	15	41	-23	20
	14	-18	-35	20	X	-06	-19	03	22	05	12
Hypothesis 251. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and maternal report of Locus of Control (159).	10	-06	16	07	06	-07	11	-22	04	-08	84
	14	(28)	06	19	16	-04	25	-04	25	-05	76
Hypothesis 252. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Implementation (139).	10	14	-22	-16	X	-05	25	-19	-10	-08	33
	14	03	-14	-05	X	-02	32	02	-03	-22	48
Hypothesis 253. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Attitude Toward Nonacademic Task Achievement (146).	10	01	-13	-24	X	-10	32	-17	-10	-16	25
	14	20	04	-21	X	-07	11	08	(-27)	-26	21
Hypothesis 254. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Authority: Task Achievement Orientation in Authority Relations (147).	10	-04	-19	-19	18	03	(30)	-14	-16	-20	20
	14	09	11	-43	14	-03	(27)	08	-36	-15	00
Hypothesis 255. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Coping Effectiveness (151).	10	-13	20	-09	08	-08	43	-13	13	17	14
	14	19	19	07	-01	12	21	(28)	03	20	90
Hypothesis 256. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Aggression: Coping Effectiveness (158).	10	11	-15	-14	X	-16	-06	(30)	15	-13	45
	14	02	-33	10	X	02	-22	-28	-12	10	34

Correlations with Achievement (continued)

	Age	Bras.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 257. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and maternal report of Locus of Control (159).	10	05	11	04	(29)	01	10	-01	(-26)	03	75
	14	-00	00	20	06	14	16	-11	36	-07	46
Hypothesis 258. There will be a positive relationship between Grade Point Average (4) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Implementation (139).	10	05	-18	-13	X	-33	07	-23	08	24	17
	14	-01	-25	(28)	X	13	32	04	-16	-22	(07)
Hypothesis 259. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Nonacademic Achievement: Attitude Toward Nonacademic Task Achievement (146).	10	-07	-19	-12	19	-35	14	15	-03	-06	41
	14	02	11	-02	-02	-00	11	03	(-27)	-13	74
Hypothesis 260. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Authority: Task Achievement Orientation in Authority Relations (147).	10	-13	-14	-04	06	-06	03	05	-00	-19	89
	14	06	06	-23	-11	-02	19	02	-10	-13	70
Hypothesis 261. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Interpersonal Relations: Coping Effectiveness (151).	10	-01	04	-11	-13	-03	43	-01	14	14	64
	14	09	13	05	01	-05	13	10	-14	05	92
Hypothesis 262. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Aggression: Coping Effectiveness (158).	10	-35	-22	04	X	-22	03	05	24	04	18
	14	-18	-37	14	X	-09	04	-01	12	08	31
Hypothesis 263. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and maternal report of Locus of Control (159).	10	10	12	05	-03	20	25	-32	-18	-02	24
	14	08	-11	00	-14	05	-09	01	04	-14	96

Correlations with Coping Effectiveness

Hypothesis 264. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151) and IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (8) (Germany, 7).	10	00	X	10	24	12	(30)	01	-12	19	54
	14	24	X	-18	24	07	08	-07	42	02	18
Hypothesis 265. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151).	10	18	04	(27)	X	-03	10	(-31)	03	02	39
	14	-04	12	04	X	-17	25	-12	08	25	41
Hypothesis 266. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151).	10	10	32	20	X	08	14	07	-05	03	81
	14	-06	15	07	X	07	-26	-25	10	-03	52
Hypothesis 267. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151).	10	-15	-02	-20	X	-40	-08	-26	-35	-25	83
	14	-00	-03	-03	X	-09	-23	(28)	-08	-09	53
Hypothesis 268. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151).	10	-18	01	-20	X	-32	(-28)	-08	-10	02	82
	14	-20	-37	03	X	-01	-35	09	14	-15	18
Hypothesis 269. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151) and IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (57) (German, 77).	10	-26	(28)	-02	10	-05	-17	-18	-06	08	46
	14	24	24	14	-21	16	25	09	-10	-01	75
Hypothesis 270. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112).	10	-19	-33	04	-19	16	21	09	36	25	08
	14	04	34	08	-25	04	09	03	-17	03	73
Hypothesis 271. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151) and IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 4 (140) (Germany, Story 2 - 143).	10	03	05	-09	-06	-07	02	18	-10	22	76
	14	01	-17	4[illegible]	-14	01	05	00	14	03	37

Correlations with Coping Effectiveness (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 272. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151) and IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 7 (143).	10	-36	-20	14	X	-07	14	13	-06	(-30)	15
	14	-17	18	-05	X	10	27	-34	(-32)	06	12
Hypothesis 273. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (151) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany, 227).	10	11	-06	15	36	-13	32	-02	22	-06	49
	14	13	10	10	-07	19	43	-06	-09	-09	34
Hypothesis 274. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and Aggression-Coping Effectiveness as assessed by BRS (10) (Germany, 12).	10	-21	X	-01	X	-15	20	47	30	00	(08)
	14	-01	X	(-30)	X	03	18	-22	19	-03	28
Hypothesis 275. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and Aggression - Coping Effectiveness as assessed by BRS (11).	10	-32	X	06	X	-04	-07	-09	-34	04	53
	14	-19	X	22	X	15	-04	-19	04	-10	65
Hypothesis 276. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and SAI Active Coping (41).	10	-38	-07	21	X	-07	(27)	-09	11	-25	(09)
	14	-02	-07	-24	X	17	-08	(-30)	-10	08	70
Hypothesis 277. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and SAI Passive Coping (42).	10	-44	-06	35	X	11	-05	-02	37	04	01
	14	-32	-08	-01	X	04	-23	(-30)	03	-04	71
Hypothesis 278. There will be a negative relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and SAI Active Defensive (43).	10	-03	-11	-03	X	-23	21	-20	-21	-12	41
	14	-01	12	06	X	-08	-03	14	08	-11	95
Hypothesis 279. There will be a negative relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and SAI Passive Defensive (44).	10	15	12	02	X	-18	39	-43	-20	-01	01
	14	-10	11	26	X	-08	-21	07	08	-18	47
Hypothesis 280. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and Aggression - Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (74) (Germany, 103).	10	36	-07	-05	X	08	-05	-17	16	14	40
	14	-32	-15	-08	X	-00	-28	05	-15	-10	70
Hypothesis 281. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) (Germany, 112).	10	01	-04	19	X	09	05	-16	21	-10	68
	14	-35	-35	-07	X	-14	16	-37	04	01	14
Hypothesis 282. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and Aggression-Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 8 (144) (Germany, Story 3 - 157).	10	20	20	-09	X	00	07	07	10	-06	86
	14	11	-26	05	X	-11	-02	(-32)	-04	02	43
Hypothesis 283. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Self-Report (158) and Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) (Germany, 227).	10	-07	13	-07	X	-15	-18	02	(26)	17	42
	14	21	-10	-06	X	14	15	-20	-08	06	56

Correlations with Coping Style Measures

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 284. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Stance as measured by Self-Report (Stage II - Var. 148) and Child's IPR Stance as measured by Sentence Completion (Stage I - Var. 55) (Germany, Stage III - 74).	10	10	17	15	20	06	02	-08	-01	[illegible]	96
	14	17	31	07	[illegible]	-02	25	-03	12	09	81
Hypothesis 285. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Engagement as measured by Self-Report (149) and child's IPR Engagement as measured by Story 4 (102).	10	-04	19	-14	X	(-29)	-02	06	-01	03	82
	14	[illegible]	05	(-29)	X	-08	-12	16	16	01	76
Hypothesis 286. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Engagement as measured by Self-Report (149) and child's IPR Engagement as measured by Story 7 (120).	10	-21	-39	-11	X	(28)	05	-17	-01	-08	15
	14	-15	05	02	X	23	-37	-15	06	-13	34

Correlations with
Coping Style (continued)

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P<
Hypothesis 287. There will be a negative relationship between maternal IPR Affect as measured by Self-Report (150) and IPR Negative Affect expressed by the child as measured by Sentence Completion (58) (Germany, 78).	10	39	-10	-05	13	-03	16	22	-03	09	39
	14	(-26)	-15	00	04	-33	-47	-04	04	-03	53
Hypothesis 288. There will be a negative relationship between maternal IPR Affect as measured by Self-Report (150) and child's IPR Neutral Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (59) (Germany, 80).	10	-44	10	02	-12	03	-16	-22	03	-10	21
	14	24	21	-00	-07	19	44	02	-04	03	64
Hypothesis 289. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Affect as measured by Self-Report (150) and child's IPR Positive Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (60) (Germany, 81).	10	21	X	20	(-29)	00	X	X	X	07	46
	14	06	-19	X	X	24	14	11	X	X	27
Hypothesis 290. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Affect as measured by Self-Report (150) and child's IPR Affect about the Problem as measured by Story 4 (105).	10	-16	08	-04	X	05	-05	00	(-28)	-18	49
	14	-17	09	21	X	-20	06	-23	01	05	51
Hypothesis 291. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Affect as measured by Self-Report (150) and child's IPR Affect about the Problem as measured by Story 7 (123).	10	(-28)	-19	11	X	05	04	16	-11	06	61
	14	-20	(28)	-08	X	31	05	-15	-39	-17	03
Hypothesis 292. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Affect as measured by Self-Report (150) and child's IPR Affect about the Outcome as measured by Story 4 (106) (Germany, Story 2 - 141).	10	-00	04	12	12	17	-03	-35	25	-10	47
	14	03	-00	-1[illegible]	-21	(30)	15	-12	08	-35	43
Hypothesis 293. There will be a positive relationship between maternal IPR Affect as measured by Self-Report (150) and child's IPR Affect about the Outcome as measured by Story 7 (124).	10	15	-05	12	X	03	-09	05	02	16	88
	14	03	06	04	X	18	02	13	04	-05	99
Hypothesis 294. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Stance as measured by Self-Report (155) and child's Aggression -Stance as measured by Sentence Completion (72).	10	36	00	24	X	-04	-35	(-29)	01	-04	13
	14	-06	04	-24	X	24	-25	09	-18	11	30
Hypothesis 295. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Engagement as measured by Self-Report (156) and child's Aggression-Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (73).	10	35	X	08	X	-19	X	-02	15	16	36
	14	-11	-03	-06	X	35	10	X	-21	17	19
Hypothesis 296. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Aggression Engagement as measured by Self-Report (156) and child's Aggression-Engagement as measured by Story 8 (126).	10	17	(27)	13	X	07	X	04	23	-06	68
	14	26	-01	14	X	10	12	-43	-24	16	05
Hypothesis 297. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Affect about Aggression as measured by Self-Report (157) and child's Aggression - Affect about the Problem as measured by Story 8 (129).	10	-21	-03	-25	X	38	16	(31)	-05	10	04
	14	49	-16	-48	X	00	09	-01	03	03	01
Hypothesis 298. There will be a positive relationship between maternal Affect about Aggression as measured by Self-Report (157) and child's Aggression-Affect about the Outcome as measured by Story 8 (130) (Germany, Story 3 - 155).	10	19	00	X	X	-19	-22	-20	-09	-34	18
	14	23	X	10	X	-10	-10	-01	-31	21	34
Hypothesis 299. There will be no significant relationship between maternal Affect about Aggression as measured by Self-Report (157) and child's Aggression-Neutral Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (76) (Germany, 106).	10	09	-12	02	X	11	10	-13	-14	03	86
	14	-22	-04	-08	X	-03	-07	22	-05	01	82
Hypothesis 300. There will be a negative relationship between maternal Affect about Aggression as measured by Self-Report (157) and child's Aggression Negative Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (75) (Germany, Hostile - 104).	10	-09	12	-02	X	-11	-10	13	14	-03	86
	14	22	04	08	X	03	07	-22	05	-01	82

example, in Hypothesis 247 at age fourteen, the mother's attitude toward her own work was negatively correlated with children's Mathematics Achievement in England, Germany, and Austin. The relationship was also negative in England among the ten-year-olds, although it was positive in Yugoslavia at this age. Similarly, mothers in England and Austin who reported a task achievement orientation on the job, in Hypothesis 254, had children whose Reading Achievement was less than average. There was a near-significant positive relationship between maternal task orientation and child Reading Achievement, however, in Yugoslavia, at both ages.

There did appear to be some national differences which might bear interpretation, at least in those stations where the number of significant correlations exceeded chance expectation. Yugoslavia and Austin had twenty-two such correlations out of a total of one hundred twenty while Brazil had nineteen such correlations. The variables on which the significant correlations occurred were substantially different, however, in each of these three countries.

MOTHERS' CAREER ASPIRATIONS COMPARED WITH THEIR CHILDREN's ASPIRATIONS AND ACHIEVEMENT

As an index of maternal ignorance of their own children's values, hopes, and expectations, the evidence in Table 4 is all too consistent. Only in Italy did the mothers' occupational aspiration level come anywhere close to matching the child's aspiration level. Elsewhere, the evidence for Hypothesis 301 showed a significant negative correlation between mother's and child's occupational aspiration levels at age ten in Chicago. In no other station, at either age, did the mothers' aspirations correlate significantly with the aspirations of their own children.

When asked directly to report their children's occupational aspirations, as in Hypothesis 302, the mothers in Brazil showed some accuracy for ten-year-olds; in Mexico, for fourteen-year-olds; in Yugoslavia, at both ages; and in Japan, for the fourteen-year-olds. The mothers in the other stations showed very little accuracy in estimating how far their children wanted to rise in occupational status.

A similar pattern appeared on Hypothesis 303 which tested the relationship between maternal and child occupational expectation levels. At age ten, there was a significant positive correlation only in Austin; at fourteen, only in Mexico and Germany.

In general, the mothers in most stations have only the haziest, inaccurate concept of how far their children want to go in life and there is very little relationship between the children's aspirations and their mothers' aspirations for them.

The one notable exception to this general observation occurs in the places where the mothers have had direct information from the school on their children's performance. Hypothesis 311, for example, tested the relationship between the child's Mathematics Achievement and the mother's hopes for the child's educational level. There was a significant positive relationship in four countires, at age ten: England, Italy, Germany, and Yugoslavia; and this held up at fourteen in England and Yugoslavia. The correlations did not reach significance, however, in the other countries. The evidence for Hypothesis 313, on the other hand, showed contradictory evidence. At age ten, in Yugoslavia, mothers' Occupational Aspiration for child was positively correlated with the child's Math Achievement. But in Chicago and Austin, at the same age, this relationship was negative.

Hypothesis 316 showed a substantial number of positive correlations between mother's Aspiration for the child's Academic Achievement and the child's actual Reading Achievement. The correlations were positive and significant at age ten in England, Italy, and Yugoslavia; and at fourteen, in Mexico, England, Italy, Germany, Yugoslavia, and Japan. Clearly, in these countries the mothers' aspirations were fairly realistically attuned to what must have been a reasonably accurate perception of their children's reading ability, particularly at fourteen years of age (see Hypotheses 25 and 36 in Table 1).

On Hypothesis 317, the correlations were considerably smaller and less frequent between the child's Reading Achievement and the level of the mother's Occupational Expectation.

The evidence for Hypothesis 322 showed a somewhat similar pattern of positive correlations between maternal Occupational Expectation and the child's GPA: in Brazil, Germany, Yugoslavia, and Austin at ten; in Germany, Yugoslavia, and Chicago at fourteen. Somewhat similarly, Hypothesis 323 found significant positive correlations at age fourteen between child's GPA and mother's Occupational Aspiration in Mexico, Germany, Italy, and Yugoslavia, although there was a significant negative correlation in England.

Thus, in a number of countries the mothers showed at least a rough correlation between their aspirations for their children and their children's school grades and reading achievement. Nonetheless, their hopes had little to do with their children's actual aspirations and expectations. They just did not seem to know very much about what their children hoped to do in life.

Table 4

Mother's Career Aspirations for Child Correlated with Child's Aspirations and Achievements

	Age	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Ger.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan	IND P <
Correlations with Aspirations and Expectations											
Hypothesis 301. There will be a positive relationship between mother's occupational aspiration for child (145) and child's occupational aspiration level (38) (Germany, 31).	10	07	12	05	10	30	18	-34	-16	05	27
	14	18	-05	02	09	56	19	-06	-12	17	27
Hypothesis 302. There will be a positive relationship between mother's report of child's occupational aspiration level (140) and child's occupational aspiration level (38) (Germany, 31).	10	46	11	08	13	-09	50	20	-10	-07	03
	14	23	(29)	09	21	33	43	02	01	(28)	47
Hypothesis 303. There will be a positive relationship between mother's occupational expectation for child (141) and child's occupational expectation level (37) (Germany, 32).	10	-01	02	-03	-09	00	19	07	44	02	65
	14	27	38	-02	35	10	26	15	-26	06	17
Correlations with Achievement											
Hypothesis 306. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and Mother's Aspiration for Child's Academic Achievement (137).	10	18	23	42	(28)	07	06	-03	19	21	28
	14	-11	25	47	54	26	21	13	03	(27)	32
Hypothesis 307. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and Level of Mother's Occupational Expectation for Child (141).	10	39	-05	04	52	05	19	-17	21	03	41
	14	-13	07	-24	24	16	10	13	-16	17	42
Hypothesis 308. There will be a positive relationship between the Raven score (1) and Level of Mother's Occupational Aspiration for Child (145).	10	19	02	-15	08	-14	20	-19	-04	39	(10)
	14	-07	37	-04	11	18	05	02	14	01	63
Hypothesis 311. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and Mother's Aspiration for Child's Academic Achievement (137).	10	-08	22	51	54	31	47	16	11	16	(07)
	14	-05	26	48	17	-17	37	22	08	25	15
Hypothesis 312. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and Level of Mother's Occupational Expectation for Child (141).	10	11	05	22	35	-03	(30)	06	06	-05	65
	14	05	12	-20	-31	08	08	09	-18	18	59
Hypothesis 313. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and Level of Mother's Occupational Aspiration for Child (145).	10	-01	02	-03	-01	-18	38	(-28)	(-29)	15	14
	14	-17	11	-20	15	11	20	05	19	07	44
Hypothesis 316. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and Mother's Aspiration for Child's Academic Achievement (137).	10	-04	12	57	35	14	54	05	23	12	02
	14	11	36	55	65	69	33	00	25	40	28
Hypothesis 317. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and Level of Mother's Occupational Expectation for Child (141).	10	32	35	18	03	09	22	-10	34	08	26
	14	(30)	18	-21	37	05	32	24	04	24	18
Hypothesis 318. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and Level of Mother's Occupational Aspiration for Child (145).	10	25	08	-03	-10	11	23	-40	-23	19	(06)
	14	06	23	-09	34	(30)	32	16	-09	13	53
Hypothesis 321. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and Mother's Aspiration for Child's Academic Achievement (137).	10	-00	-21	58	22	01	41	16	21	07	02
	14	-05	22	24	15	14	57	22	05	04	(09)
Hypothesis 322. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and Level of Mother's Occupational Expectation for Child (141).	10	31	15	22	34	20	37	06	34	-02	71
	14	02	20	01	31	19	(28)	(31)	07	13	72
Hypothesis 323. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and Level of Mother's Occupational Aspiration for Child (145).	10	-10	00	01	05	10	20	-27	-15	10	54
	14	-23	(31)	-41	35	42	41	-04	-01	-01	01
Hypothesis 326. There will be a positive relationship between BRS Task Achievement (5) and Mother's Aspiration for Child's Academic Achievement (137).	10	-06	X	(26)	11	07	62	04	15	10	(09)
	14	08	X	17	-12	15	56	18	04	-04	16
Hypothesis 327. There will be a positive relationship between BRS Task Achievement (5) and Level of Mother's Occupational Expectation for Child (141).	10	-00	X	31	09	04	37	09	33	00	35
	14	19	X	05	-21	(30)	23	20	-02	11	64
Hypothesis 328. There will be a positive relationship between BRS Task Achievement (5) and Level of Mother's Occupational Aspiration for Child (145).	10	-15	X	-07	-07	-03	43	-11	14	07	14
	14	-18	X	-19	08	34	37	26	-17	-09	01

COMPARISON OF FATHER INTERVIEW DATA WITH CHILD CHARACTERISTICS

Because of the small size of the father samples, only forty in each country, the scores of all forty fathers were combined for correlation with the Stage I measures obtained on the children.

In general, the fathers turned out to know even less than the mothers about their children's behavior or their school performance. In Yugoslavia and Japan they had a little knowledge of their children's Mathematics Achievement but the correlations in the other countries were insignificant. The fathers in Mexico and Yugoslavia knew little about their children's Reading Achievement. Even Grade Point Average, however, which is at least available to most of the fathers, was not estimated very closely. Only in Brazil, Mexico, and Yugoslavia did the paternal reports of child achievement correlate significantly with GPA; in England and Japan the correlation approached significance. In Italy, Chicago, and Austin there was simply no relationship between paternal reports and actual child achievement as measured by grade average.

The findings reported in Table 5 on all of the other hypotheses can be very simply summed up. With two partial exceptions, the picture the fathers presented of their children had no more than minor, accidental points of resemblance to any of the measures of coping behavior obtained in Stage I. This was largely true even in the case of Hypothesis 45, which compared the peer BRS rating of Academic Coping Effectiveness with the fathers' reports of Academic Achievement.

The fathers' reports of Academic Achievement did correlate positively and significantly with the total Coping Effectiveness score on the Sentence Completion in Brazil, Italy, and Chicago, and almost reached significant correlation in Yugoslavia. The fathers' report of the child's Engagement in situations involving Aggression correlated positively and significantly with the score on this same dimension, as measured by Story Completion 9, in Italy, Yugoslavia, and Chicago. Otherwise, the correlation coefficients were small and extremely scattered, no more in aggregate than would be expected by chance.

The conclusion appears inescapable that fathers in all of these countries know far less about their children than do the mothers. The fathers in Brazil, Mexico, Yugoslavia, and Japan showed a slight degree of acquaintance with their children's academic performance but even this was not true in England, Chicago or Austin. In all other aspects of child behavior, whether the criterion be a peer rating or a self-report, the fathers' descriptions of their children bore almost no resemblance to the independent evidence about those children's actual behavior.

It would appear that urbanization has so thoroughly separated fathers from their children that most fathers literally know very little that is true and accurate about their own children. Indeed, it almost seems as if the fathers do not observe their children alertly, even in the home setting, or they would have shown more accurate perceptions of their coping behavior.

COMPARISON OF PATERNAL INTERVIEW DATA WITH CHILD CHARACTERISTICS

Table 5

Paternal Reports of Child Coping Correlated with Actual Child Achievement and Coping Scores

	Correlations on Total Sample							
	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Italy	Yugo	Chi.	Aust.	Japan
Correlations With Achievement								
Hypothesis 14. There will be a positive relationship between Mathematics Achievement (2) and paternal report of Academic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (105).	17	17	13	-01	23	10	11	24
Hypothesis 25. There will be a positive relationship between Reading Achievement (3) and paternal report of Academic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (105).	-04	26	10	12	(21)	03	15	10
Hypothesis 36. There will be a positive relationship between GPA (4) and paternal report of Academic Achievement: Coping Effectiveness (105).	26	38	(19)	04	27	01	11	(19)
Correlations With Coping Effectiveness								
Hypothesis 45. There will be a positive relationship between Academic T.A. Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (5) and paternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	16	28	08	13	(19)	18	-01	(18)
Hypothesis 46. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and paternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	08	11	23	13	07	09	-05	-06
Hypothesis 47. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and paternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	03	10	02	-00	-07	09	12	-05
Hypothesis 48. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and paternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	03	-04	-01	-24	-14	-15	01	-02
Hypothesis 49. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and paternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	05	07	-02	01	05	-04	-11	-07
Hypothesis 51. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (79) and paternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	26	07	-01	21	(-19)	26	-10	06
Hypothesis 53. There will be a positive relationship between Total Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story Completion (146) and paternal report of Academic Achievement (105).	-16	05	07	14	-08	02	-14	04
Hypothesis 63. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (8) and paternal report (119).	-01	11	-05	04	(19)	07	(-19)	-11
Hypothesis 64. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and paternal report of IPR - Coping Effectiveness (119).	04	12	29	11	15	13	-08	-01
Hypothesis 65. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and paternal report of IPR - Coping Effectiveness (119).	-01	13	03	-06	-01	10	08	-03
Hypothesis 66. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and paternal report of IPR - Coping Effectiveness (119).	08	-08	-10	-22	-10	-14	06	12
Hypothesis 67. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and paternal report of IPR - Coping Effectiveness (119).	06	07	05	-06	10	-04	-05	(-19)
Hypothesis 68. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (57) and paternal report (119)	09	-13	-06	02	-08	09	-05	05
Hypothesis 70. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 4 (140) and paternal report (119).	-04	(22)	-01	14	-15	-12	-23	02
Hypothesis 71. There will be a positive relationship between Interpersonal Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 7 (143) and paternal report (119).	-06	02	-01	12	-05	06	-01	07

Correlations With Coping Effectiveness (continued)

	Correlations on Total Sample							
	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan
Hypothesis 73. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (9) and paternal report (125).	-11	09	04	-03	-13	03	04	-12
Hypothesis 74. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and paternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	-00	14	31	01	04	08	-03	-06
Hypothesis 75. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and paternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	03	23	03	-07	02	11	13	-08
Hypothesis 76. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and paternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	-06	-05	07	-18	-22	-07	-02	02
Hypothesis 77. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and paternal report of Anxiety Coping Effectiveness (125).	-03	13	07	-00	00	05	10	-08
Hypothesis 78. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (69) and by paternal report (125).	06	07	-02	14	-01	16	-12	-08
Hypothesis 80. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 4 (141) and by paternal report (125).	-12	-06	-09	(21)	-07	-02	(21)	15
Hypothesis 82. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (7) and by paternal report (115).	-08	12	01	07	06	16	-08	-01
Hypothesis 83. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and paternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	02	04	29	06	11	08	-07	-01
Hypothesis 84. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and paternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	-08	12	04	-04	-05	05	17	-07
Hypothesis 85. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and paternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	03	-07	-11	-16	-11	-11	-00	09
Hypothesis 86. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and paternal report of Authority Coping Effectiveness (115).	01	06	06	03	07	00	-08	(-19)
Hypothesis 87. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (63) and by paternal report (115).	28	-14	10	-02	-10	18	-08	02
Hypothesis 89. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 2 (139) and by paternal report (115).	08	05	02	-05	06	10	-16	-11
Hypothesis 90. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 10 (145) and by paternal report (115).	(-21)	-09	10	-14	07	02	-05	-00
Hypothesis 92. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (10) and by paternal report (128).	02	25	-07	-01	05	04	03	-09
Hypothesis 93. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by BRS (11) and by paternal report (128).	02	06	09	03	10	25	16	-01
Hypothesis 94. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Active Coping (41) and paternal report of Aggression - Coping Effectiveness (128).	02	08	24	02	15	16	-06	-07
Hypothesis 95. There will be a positive relationship between SAI Passive Coping (42) and paternal report of Aggression - Coping Effectiveness (128).	-02	19	07	-07	-12	11	13	-13
Hypothesis 96. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Active Defensive (43) and paternal report of Aggression - Coping Effectiveness (128).	04	02	-04	(-19)	-04	-12	-04	-04
Hypothesis 97. There will be a negative relationship between SAI Passive Defensive (44) and paternal report of Aggression - Coping Effectiveness (128).	12	08	13	-09	07	04	-07	-06
Hypothesis 98. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Sentence Completion (74) and by paternal report (128).	14	05	09	10	-13	19	10	12

Correlations With
Coping Effectiveness (continued)

	Correlations on Total Sample							
	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan
Hypothesis 100. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Coping Effectiveness as measured by Story 8 (144) and by paternal report (128).	-11	-18	-04	18	03	23	07	-12
Correlations With Coping Style Measures								
Hypothesis 102. There will be a positive relationship between Academic T.A. Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (50) and by paternal report (102).	-06	01	-05	10	-03	09	04	10
Hypothesis 103. There will be a positive relationship between Academic T.A. Engagement as measured by Story 1 (89) and by paternal report of Academic T.A. - Engagement (102).	-11	-01	15	08	02	-23	-21	-10
Hypothesis 105. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Stance as measured by Sentence Completion (55) and by paternal report of IPR Stance (116).	15	13	-14	11	03	08	-13	12
Hypothesis 106. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (56) and by paternal report of IPR Engagement (117).	-11	02	03	09	-07	-00	-07	-14
Hypothesis 107. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Engagement as measured by Story 4 (102) and by paternal report (117).	-04	16	-03	02	-03	-14	(-19)	(20)
Hypothesis 109. There will be a negative relationship between Negative IPR Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (58) and Affect as measured by paternal report (118).	10	05	(-20)	-16	-03	04	01	-06
Hypothesis 110. There will be no significant relationship between Neutral IPR Affect as measured by Sentence Completion (59) and Affect as measured by paternal report (118).	-13	-09	26	01	-02	05	01	04
Hypothesis 111. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Affect about the problem as measured by Story 4 (105) and by paternal report (118).	04	-06	-06	-05	04	-14	-02	09
Hypothesis 112. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Affect about the problem as measured by Story 7 (123) and by paternal report (118).	-10	-00	-06	-09	09	-05	-05	05
Hypothesis 113. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 4 (106) and by paternal report (118).	-10	-02	-13	17	01	-24	-01	-00
Hypothesis 114. There will be a positive relationship between IPR Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 7 (124) and paternal report (118).	15	04	-04	04	-13	-19	-03	-09
Hypothesis 115. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Stance as measured by Sentence Completion (67) and by paternal report (121).	-06	10	-05	(19)	09	15	-03	-09
Hypothesis 116. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (68) and by paternal report (122).	-02	18	02	-04	03	09	01	-08
Hypothesis 117. There will be a positive relationship between Anxiety Engagement as measured by Story 5 (108) and by paternal report (122).	02	-04	-11	-03	(-19)	-09	08	12
Hypothesis 118. There will be a negative relationship between Negative Affect about Anxiety as measured by Sentence Completion (70) and Affect as measured by paternal report (124).	03	03	-03	(-19)	12	-06	01	23
Hypothesis 119. There will be no significant relationship between Neutral Affect about Anxiety as measured by Sentence Completion (71) and Affect as measured by paternal report (124).	-03	-03	03	(19)	-12	06	-01	23
Hypothesis 120. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the problem as measured by Story 5 (111) and by paternal report of Anxiety-Affect (124).	-06	-03	-01	15	-04	-03	02	03
Hypothesis 121. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 5 (112) and by paternal report of Anxiety-Affect (124).	02	09	07	-02	-01	-13	06	-01

Correlations With Coping Style Measures (continued)

	Correlations on Total Sample							
	Braz	Mex.	Eng.	Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan
Hypothesis 122. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (62) and by paternal report (113).	12	-12	03	-01	-26	-02	-03	-01
Hypothesis 123. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Engagement as measured by Story 2 (97) and by paternal report (113).	04	02	01	-05	10	04	(-19)	-09
Hypothesis 124. There will be a positive relationship between Authority Engagement as measured by Story 10 (132) and by paternal report (113).	-13	-12	00	05	05	02	10	06
Hypothesis 125. There will be a negative relationship between Negative Affect about Authority as measured by Sentence Completion (64) and Affect as measured by paternal report (114).	-30	08	-08	-16	10	-09	-00	-08
Hypothesis 126. There will be no significant relationship between Neutral Affect about Authority as measured by Sentence Completion (65) and Affect as measured by paternal report (114).	28	-08	04	17	-15	10	00	12
Hypothesis 127. There will be a positive relationship between Positive Affect about Authority as measured by Sentence Completion (66) and Affect as measured by paternal report (114).	06	X	22	-06	18	-08	X	-15
Hypothesis 128. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the problem as measured by Story 2 (99) and by paternal report of Authority-Affect (114).	-07	04	14	-06	18	18	12	09
Hypothesis 129. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the problem as measured by Story 10 (135) and by paternal report of Authority-Affect (114).	07	12	-08	09	-07	04	04	11
Hypothesis 130. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 2 (100) and by paternal report of Authority-Affect (114).	-08	07	-07	07	-03	02	-23	-13
Hypothesis 131. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 10 (136) and by paternal report of Authority-Affect (114).	-08	00	06	11	12	-10	07	07
Hypothesis 132. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Engagement as measured by Sentence Completion (73) and by paternal report (126).	-01	-13	-05	14	-15	27	-04	05
Hypothesis 133. There will be a positive relationship between Aggression Engagement as measured by Story 9 (126) and by paternal report (126).	-06	-15	-09	26	23	30	17	-15
Hypothesis 134. There will be a negative relationship between Negative Affect about Aggression as measured by Sentence Completion (75) and Affect as measured by paternal report (127).	-10	-09	-13	-15	(21)	-05	-18	-18
Hypothesis 135. There will be no significant relationship between Neutral Affect about Aggression as measured by Sentence Completion (76) and Affect as measured by paternal report (127).	10	09	13	15	(-21)	05	18	18
Hypothesis 136. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the problem as measured by Story 8 (129) and Affect as measured by paternal report of Aggression - Affect (127).	-13	03	-01	06	-04	-14	-02	-14
Hypothesis 137. There will be a positive relationship between Affect about the outcome as measured by Story 8 (130) and by paternal report of Aggression - Affect (127).	-12	05	03	-07	-10	-03	09	-08

Note: Underlined correlation coefficients are significant at or below the .05 level.
Correlations shown in parentheses are significant between the .05 and .10 levels.

COMPARISON OF FATHER AND MOTHER DESCRIPTIONS OF THEIR CHILD

Table 6 shows the results of correlating the mother and father descriptions. These are descriptions of the same child as seen by the two parents.

There were notable national differences in the amount of parental agreement in describing the child's behavior. In Brazil, only two of the thirty comparisons showed significant, positive correlations between mother and father. In Italy, none of the correlations reached a significant size. In Chicago, there were seven correlations significant at or below the .10 level but six of these seven were negative. The fathers and mothers in Chicago actively disagreed about most of the things they reported about the same child. This was somewhat true, though to a lesser extent, in Mexico City. There, five correlations were significantly large but two of them were negative. The mothers and fathers in Mexico City agreed on the child's degree of Coping Effectiveness in school, his capacity to engage himself in dealing with people in authority, and the number of out-of-school-activities he pursued. They disagreed, however, about the degree of initiative he showed in pursuing home duties and also about the kind of affect he displayed in interpersonal relationships.

In England, Yugoslavia, and Austin five of the thirty comparisons showed significant correlations between father and mother in a positive direction. The largest of these correlations was only .31, however, and most of them were appreciably lower than that. The amount of agreement between the fathers and mothers in these centers was just barely enough to exceed the chance level.

The one notable exception to this general pattern of weak agreement between mother and father occurred in Japan. The Japanese parents agreed on ten of the thirty variables to a significant degree and always in a positive direction. They agreed as closely as .53 on whether the child had an outside job and they correlated .50 in describing the level of activity between parents and child. It would appear to be a reasonably safe inference that family closeness is more marked in Japan, even in as urbanized a center as Tokyo, than in any of the other countries in this study. The fathers and mothers agree in describing a larger array of child characteristics and they agree more substantially.

COMPARISON OF MOTHER AND FATHER SELF-DESCRIPTIONS

Table 7 presents a direct comparison of the self-descriptions by the mother and by the father. This table can be read inferentially for similarity or difference of maternal and paternal sex roles in the various societies. There was a substantial difference among the countries both in the amount of similarity shown and in the particular places where similarities and differences occurred.

COMPARISON OF MOTHER AND FATHER DATA

Table 6

Correlations of Mother and Father Descriptions of Their Child

Variable	Braz.	Mex.	Eng.		Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan
102. Academic Task Achievement - Engagement	-07	09	09		18	-02	-01	15	-06
103. Academic Task Achievement - Initiation	13	12	(20)		01	10	09	02	08
105. Academic Task Achievement - Coping Effectiveness	14	30	10		14	(20)	02	15	11
106. Academic Task Achievement - Persistence	04	05	-05		-12	07	(-20)	12	22
107. Academic Task Achievement - Level of Education Expected	06	-05	(18)		-12	23	-04	06	04
108. Attitude Toward School	21	02	13		01	08	04	23	-12
109. Duties at Home - Initiation	07	-27	22		17	09	-23	10	23
110. Duties at Home - Implementation	17	17	17		-04	26	-06	15	22
111. Duties at Home - Coping Effectiveness	07	06	15		02	12	-17	17	04
129. Number of Household Chores	25	13	28		09	25	-09	11	29
130. Does Child Have Outside Job	-12	14	17		X	08	39	29	53
112. Out-of-School Activities - Number	15	(19)	08		01	16	07	26	41
113. Authority - Engagement	17	25	-05		-06	07	-08	-03	(19)
114. Authority - Affect	11	10	-01		12	08	-17	-02	25
115. Authority - Coping Effectiveness	06	18	-01		11	08	(-21)	-05	18
116. IPR - Stance	06	-12	-06		-05	03	-17	12	07
117. IPR - Engagement	02	01	06		03	-08	-17	23	11
118. IPR - Affect	-06	(-20)	-08		-15	00	-12	-06	08
119. IPR - Coping Effectiveness	05	-17	-10		-04	17	-07	-14	11
120. IPR - Type of Peer Influence on Child's Behavior	08	-05	13		-06	31	-25	06	-04
121. Anxiety - Stance	-05	- 13	-05		-02	18	-19	00	(19)
122. Anxiety - Engagement	-09	-10	-02		06	09	(-21)	03	21
123. Anxiety - Aid/Advice	-11	14	-03		05	13	-13	00	02
124. Anxiety - Affect	-11	01	-17		09	-10	-04	13	06
125. Anxiety - Coping Effectiveness	-04	-06	-11		04	08	-12	03	15
126. Aggression - Engagement	06	-08	(-20)		-16	07	(-20)	06	-05
127. Aggression - Affect	-19	-08	-11		-11	09	-18	13	00
128. Aggression - Coping Effectiveness	-08	-00	-14		-16	18	-11	13	01
131. Parent/Child Interaction - Level of Activity	08	-08	04		-00	04	-12	(20)	50
132. Parent/Child Interaction - Type of Interaction with Parent	13	-09	04		03	-03	09	12	12

In two of the locations there was a sizeable degree of positive similarity between mothers and fathers. These were Austin and Tokyo, where seven or eight out of the twenty-seven comparisons reached a significant level of correlation. In Austin, all of the seven significant correlations were positive. They dealt with self-described initiation in contacting the child's teacher; degree of satisfaction with the child's achievement in school; own implementation of tasks at adult work; occupational expectation for the child; achievement orientation on the parent's job; the degree of interpersonal orientation on the job; and coping effectiveness in dealing with aggression.

In Japan, the mothers and fathers tended to describe themselves somewhat similarly when it came to approaching teachers; intervening in their child's homework; their occupational expectations for their child; their own stance toward issues of interpersonal relations; their degree of Engagement in efforts to solve interpersonal problems; and their degree of encouragement of the child to deal actively with his own anxiety. Their self-descriptions differed significantly only in describing the degree of constructive guidance they supplied to the child. In Austin and in Tokyo there seems to be relatively little contrast between the mothers and fathers in the aspects of behavior dealt with in Table 7.

The same picture appeared to a slightly lesser degree in Yugoslavia, where mothers and fathers described themselves similarly in reporting on their satisfaction with the child's academic achievement; their implementation of work on their own jobs; the reasons they gave for disciplining their child; their estimate of their child's occupational aspiration level; and their sense of being in control of their own fate.

There was an appreciable amount of significant relationship between father and mother self-descriptions in Chicago but this was almost as often contradictory as complementary. The parents described themselves similarly when talking about their implementation of work tasks; their estimate of their child's occupational aspirations; their own attitude toward work; their degree of interpersonal orientation on the job; and their stance toward aggression. A systematic sex difference appeared, however, on the other three measures of reaction to aggression: Engagement, Affect, and Coping Effectiveness. Thus, the differences between fathers and mothers in Chicago was strictly localized to the area of behavior in the face of aggression. Otherwise, they showed a fair amount of similarity in the way they perceived their child and dealt with the world.

The evidence in the other four countries was much weaker. The mothers' and fathers' self-descriptions agreed with one another on three variables in Brazil and in England, with no disagreements. In Mexico and Italy there were hints of somewhat greater polarization of sex roles between the parents. In Mexico, mothers and fathers agreed on their satisfaction with the child's academic achievement but they disagreed in describing their own efforts to get the child to work at his studies, in the degree of constructive guidance they supplied the child, and also in the degree of interpersonal orientation they showed in their own work. In Italy, the mothers and fathers agreed on their degree of satisfaction with the child's school achievement and also in their self-descriptions of the effectiveness in coping with aggression. They disagreed rather visibly (-.35) in their statements of their own occupational aspirations for their child. They also disagreed a little in describing their own tendency to encourage the child to deal actively with his anxiety.

Table 7

Correlations of Mother and Father Self-Descriptions

Variable	Braz	Mex.	Eng.		Italy	Yugo.	Chi.	Aust.	Japan
133. Task Achievement - Initiation	16	02	-11		-07	-07	04	22	23
134. Task Achievement - Implementation	-08	-25	-04		-04	-02	04	01	07
135. Satisfaction with Child's Academic Achievement	31	27	16		33	31	13	27	04
136. Active Intervention in Child's Homework	22	-16	06		00	08	-14	14	(20)
137. Aspiration for Child's Level of Education	09	-11	04		01	15	-16	-01	01
138. Attitude Toward Function of School	15	12	-11		-03	05	-12	-07	-12
139. Work Achievement - Implementation	03	-02	-03		-05	26	32	25	10
140. Estimate of Child's Occupational Aspiration Level	19	-02	14		-03	(19)	38	-04	15
141. Occupational Expectation for Child - Level	(23)	11	37		15	16	00	26	35
145. Occupational Aspiration for Child - Level	-02	17	-03		-35	03	-13	00	(19)
142. Strength of Parental Directiveness	01	01	-17		00	13	-04	03	10
143. Degree of Constructive Guidance	03	-43	04		-02	15	-13	-02	-22
144. Reason for Discipline - Child's Growth vs Parental Guidance	-08	07	11		10	32	01	16	03
146. Attitude Toward Work	16	-18	24		-12	10	29	07	03
147. Achievement Orientation on Job	03	-12	08		-04	08	15	27	11
148. IPR - Stance	04	-08	-09		10	-09	04	03	32
149. IPR - Engagement	11	02	-06		-02	02	-08	06	(19)
150. IPR - Affect	09	-11	-14		07	06	-14	00	09
151. IPR - Coping Effectiveness	14	-07	-08		03	12	-13	10	05
152. Constructive Guidance for Child's Interpersonal/Relations	-10	15	04		-05	-12	-13	10	17
153. Degree of Interpersonal Orientation on Job	15	-23	24		-04	12	35	21	06
154. Encouraging Child to Deal Actively with his Anxiety	02	-10	03		(-20)	05	03	07	24
155. Aggression - Stance	04	-05	05		04	15	(21)	-02	01
156. Aggression - Engagement	02	05	02		01	-04	-32	04	-02
157. Aggression - Affect	01	-03	-02		12	07	-26	11	-08
158. Aggression - Coping Effectiveness	-02	-05	-07		(20)	08	-24	(19)	-04
159. Locus of Control	-13	-02	-08		05	24	-04	03	12